THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 10, 11 & 12 JANUARY—MARCH, 1946 Vol. XXXV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Professor Joad's Conversion

The *Rationalist Annual* (December, 1945) publishes an exceptionally interesting article by Professor C. E. M. Joad, 'On Being No Longer a Rationalist.' It gives Prof. Joad's reasons which have led him to abandon his rationalist attitude towards religion. Prof. Joad is so well known a public speaker, especially over the air, on metaphysical, ethical and religious issues that his statement in explanation of his change of outlook has particular significance and interest to-day.

For many years past, Prof. Joad has not believed in a Personal God, but he was not a Materialist. His metaphysical training precluded him from believing that Matter can create Mind. Neither was he a Determinist. He believed in Man's responsibility for his thoughts and actions:

> 'I knew or, if you like, felt—felt it in my bones—that we are in an important sense free; free to entertain such thoughts as seem true to us, free to do such things as seem right to us—free then, within limits, to make our lives as we choose; and this I knew, with a perfect assurance of conviction, in spite of the fact that all the obvious arguments—it was my business as a teacher of philosophy to know what the arguments were—seemed to demonstrate that this feeling of freedom must be illusory. Free will, I used to say, bearing these arguments in mind, was something that would not bear thinking about, for directly you started to think about it it evaporated. (I say designedly "all the obvious arguments," for I don't think that the position which is most easily defensible in argument is necessarily to be equated with the position which is true.)'

He believed also in the existence of 'values'—Truth, Freedom, Beauty—and his faith in them would seem to have maintained his higher life. His metaphysical and moral outlook he named (making use of the thought forms and phrases of Bernard Shaw and Samuel Butler) the Life Force philosophy. This is best defined in his own terms:

'Briefly, as I have said, this entailed the presence in the universe of an active dynamic force which I called sometimes "the Life Force," sometimes life *tout court,* which entered into matter to form living organisms. A living organism was, then, an instrument of life, created by life to further the realization of life's instinctive purpose. For life I conceived of as a purposive activity; initially unconscious, it gradually achieved consciousness in and through the living organisms in which it expressed itself . . .

'Thus life developed at ever higher levels of consciousness in pursuit of its instinctive purpose, by reason of its evolution in and through living organisms.

'Unlike Shaw and Butler, I was foolhardy enough to say what I thought this purpose which I attributed to life was. From the first I had made provision in my scheme for certain immaterial values which I conceived, after the model of Plato's Forms, as changeless, eternal, and perfect. (It will be seen that I was trying to find accommodation for three different sorts of reality within the bounds of my universe — namely, matter, the creative activity of life, and immaterial values. It was in recognition of this trinity that I called my most substantial philosophical book *Matter, Life, and Value.*)'

Experience of life, however, seemed to Prof. Joad to reveal three weaknesses in his philosophy. First, the moral life it sanctioned and inspired was not of the highest order. It turned out to be utilitarian and self regarding, not idealist and directed towards that which was infinitely above self and safety. Secondly, Prof. Joad's philosophy failed to satisfy him rationally. He writes:

'The notion of a number of absolute values . . . pieces of cosmic furniture just floating about, as it were, without visible means of support came to seem to me, in the highest degree, unplausible. Yet the arguments, mainly derived from Plato, which led me to maintain their existence, arguments which took their stand upon the objectivity both of Beauty and Goodness . . . seemed to me overwhelming. The values, then, must stand. Yet there must, I now thought, be some sort of unity in the universe to whose existence they bore witness, as its revealed aspects. Once the need for a unity of values or a unity behind values was admitted, it could be most plausibly represented as the unity of a person. Thus I was led to postulate the familiar theistic position, and came to regard the values as modes of God's expression, aspects under which He revealed Himself to man.'

The third weakness in Prof. Joad's outlook was discovered by the dark side of our Second World War. Prof. Joad's Life Force philosophy had led him to take an optimistic view of human nature and its potentialities for progress and happiness. He now saw human nature as possessed of many evil qualities which stood in need of a radical cure, but one which his philosophy could not provide. He writes:

'I now found myself quite unable to write off what I had better call man's "sinfulness" and have done with it, as a mere by-product of circumstance. For it was precisely in this light that the progressive, liberal, rationalist creed in which I had been brought up bade me regard it. The defects of human behaviour, I had been taught, were neither inevitable

nor innate. They were the effects of circumstance and environment. Of economic circumstance, for example; for how could a poor man, who was also ill-educated and brutish, desperately wondering how to get bread for his wife and children, be expected to be honest, or trustworthy, or considerate, or to show forth in his behaviour the graces of living? Or of psychological circumstance; for was not a school of psycho-analysts arising to explain how all the regressive, aggressive, or inhibited tendencies (or whatever circumlocution was adopted to avoid the necessity for calling downright human wickedness by its right name) of human nature were due to an unfortunate psychological environment in the first years of childhood? The implications of this view were obvious: change the environment, remove poverty, entrust children to the care of properly psycho-analysed parents, nurses, and teachers, and the millennium would be realized. For there was nothing wrong with human nature as such. Man was, indeed, inherently perfectible; he was prevented from achieving the perfection that was natural to him only by certain wants and lacks which science could now make good, and certain obstacles and impediments which, being man-made, could be removed by human energy and determination.'

As a consequence of his changed estimate of human nature, our Scientific Pelagian was converted to a belief in the need for Divine Grace, without which Man could not achieve salvation. This conviction led Prof. Joad to entertain the hope and faith that a personal God can and will supply such Divine Grace if humbly sought and thankfully received.

Our last passage cited from Prof. Joad's *apologia* might lead some to suppose that he vilifies Science. We can only hope that the zeal of his conversion has not led him to do this. We need greatly the contribution of Science towards the betterment of human nature, but we need also the Grace of God. There is no reason whatsoever why these two forces should not co-operate. The future salvation of mankind depends on their co-operation. When the believers in Divine Grace cease to be obscurantists and vilifiers of human nature, and the searchers after scientific enlightenment regard themselves as consciously co-operating with God in obedience to His creative will, humanity will find itself in the dawn of a new age brighter and better than any which it has yet reached. Let us hope that the conversion of Professor Joad is an *auspicium aevi melioris*.

Dr. Grundy and the Power of Prayer

In his recently published *Fifty-five Years at Oxford* (Methuen's), Dr. Grundy, the well-known classical tutor of Corpus Christi and Brasenose Colleges, concludes his autobiography with an arresting chapter entitled 'The Religion of an Individual.' The outstanding feature of Dr. Grundy's religion is the practice and power of prayer. Professor Joad, to whose Christian conversion we have referred, after many experiences in his religious life

reached a point at which prayer to a Personal God became a possibility for him. Dr. Grundy's religious life began with the practice of prayer and has developed with that practice. He writes:

> 'In some of the autobiographies I have read in recent times the authors have described at some length the searchings of mind through which they passed in deciding what form of the Christian religion most appealed to them. I never passed through that phase of religious doubt.
>
> 'The development of my religious ideas has not taken that form. The basis has always been that which I was taught as a child modified gradually by further experience. The only large (negative) feature of such a change has been a marked revolt against that tendency to anthropomorphize the divinity which has made its way into Christian as well as other religions.'
>
> 'It was from my mother that I first learned . . . to say my prayers; and I cannot remember the time at which that duty was first instilled into me. The prayers were very short; but I was always encouraged to add to formal prayer petitions in my own language. The practice of prayer became a habit, and I remember that when I was still quite a child I felt that any departure from the habit would be in some way or other the worse for me.'

Although his formal prayers were practised without mental concentration and religious emotion, Dr. Grundy notes that the *ex tempore* element in his childish prayers which he was encouraged to practise — consisting mainly of asking for blessings on his parents and nurse — were uttered with real interest and feeling. At eleven years old, he heard a sermon which inculcated the duty of understanding one's prayers and saying them with concentration and definite purpose. He took the sermon to heart and strove to practise prayer in this way. He noticed as this practice developed that 'the concentration necessary for prayer comes most easily to you when the mind is very depressed or unusually happy. Between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five he, in common with his family, passed through a period of much anxiety and depression. It was during this period that he realized that prayer had the power to remove depression. Dr. Grundy writes:

> 'This relief of mind after prayer has been noticeable on numberless occasions in my later life. I have learnt to expect it; but on many occasions it has come when I did not anticipate it.'

He came to regard this as an undoubted example of cause and effect. He writes:

> 'I would enlarge my conclusion and say that the most noticeable and most distinguishable case of God's answer to prayer is the gift of courage to face such troubles and trials of life as befall us through no fault of our own—the tragedy of life as the Greeks called it.
>
> 'I cannot form so definite a judgment as to the effect of prayer on material matters. But I do know that the last forty years of my life have been happy.
>
> 'I am anxious to put my position quite clearly even at the risk of seeming to be guilty of a certain amount of repetition.

'I would therefore put this before a reader.

'If you noticed through a long period of years a phenomenon invariably succeeded by another phenomenon — relief from mental anxiety and trouble, and in a large number of instances a recognizable relief from the causes which brought about that trouble, relief which, as I have noticed, usually takes the most unexpected forms, would you not, following those laws of inductive logic which are employed with confidence in inquiry into physical causes, come to assume that there is a causal connection between prayer and the phenomena which follow it? It may sound irreverent, but I have been led by increasing experience to take so far as is possible detached notice of such phenomena, and I cannot in the last fifty years remember any instance in which they have occurred otherwise than as I have above stated. I may say, therefore, that so far as prayer is concerned I have passed from faith to conviction.'

This conviction of undoubtedly answered prayer produced further important religious results. Dr. Grundy writes:

'I am *convinced* of the existence of a divine and almighty power with which man can be brought into communion by what is called prayer. Nor can I realize that without attaching to it as a corollary a belief in the immortality of the soul founded on surer grounds than any doctrine of human origin.'

That Dr. Grundy should have discovered in his own religious experience that prayer can create a conviction of personal immortality is of real importance. Other proofs of a future life are so much more often appealed to. We are so accustomed to arguments for a future life derived from reason — *e.g.* that human personality, although located within the human body and in some degree dependent upon it, does seem in other cases to be entirely independent of it, so that all a man's limbs may be amputated without in any way mutilating his personality, and so on. Again, the moral argument for a future life, namely, that Divine justice demands a future life in which the sins or virtues of the individual can receive their due punishment or reward, is one that has appealed very strongly to the moral consciousness of many. The historical argument for future life, based upon the evidence for survival of physical death by human personalities who have had communications with those who have 'passed over'—in short, the testimonies of psychic experience — exercise a great influence today in establishing belief in a future life. The purely religious argument, however, for future life, based upon the individual's experience of communion with God in this life, is far less commonly cited, perhaps because this kind of conviction is only rarely experienced. Yet in the Old Testament Psalms, where in those few instances the hope of a future life manifests itself, it is the outcome of a conviction derived from communion with God.

'Whom have I in heaven but thee: and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of thee.

> 'My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever'

Psalms xvi and cxxxix, without definitely affirming belief in a future life, reveal the religious experience which can become the basis for such a faith.

One point more about Dr. Grundy's prayer-experience. He has not found congregational services helpful to prayer. He finds that they interfere with the necessary concentration. 'Go into thy chamber and shut thy door, and pray to thy Father in secret.' Yet how different was the experience of S. T. Coleridge, mystic and metaphysician:

> 'O Wedding Guest! my soul hath been alone on a wide, wide sea.
> So lonely 'twas that even God scarce seemed there to be.
> O sweeter than the marriage-feast, 'tis sweeter far to me,
> To walk together to the kirk with a goodly company.
> To walk together to the kirk and all together pray,
> Where each to his great Father bends,
> Old men and babes and loving friends
> And youths and maidens gay.'

Mr. Laurence Housman as an Apologist for Modernism

Under the title 'Sin and Herd Instinct,' the *Hibbert Journal* of January publishes a remarkable article by Mr. Laurence Housman. Every modernist should read it. The great value of Mr. Housman's apology consists in his unflinching loyalty to modern science and in his unflinching loyalty to the essential religion of Jesus Christ. While he unhesitatingly abandons Traditionalism, he does this with understanding sympathy, for he recognizes the needful functions which it discharged in ages that are past, although in the present age Traditionalism is an hindrance both to the true understanding of the Christian Religion and to that Religion's right influence on a world which stands in dire need of it.

Mr. Housman begins with Sin, as did John Milton in our greatest English epic, but he no more believes in Original Sin than he does in Original Righteousness. He defines Sin as separation of man from man, the separation of man from the dictates of his moral consciousness: the separation of man from the spirit of God which is Eternal Love. Mr. Housman regards sin as 'the *reactionary tendency* in a still unresolved process of trial and error.' Sin is thus the needful accompaniment of moral evolution. He writes:

> 'Now if we accept the idea that man's growing moral sense was part of his evolution; that when he had a sense of sin he was greatly improved, so that instead of being a Fall it was a Rise — even if we accept that theory, it does not make man's need of atonement any less — so long as we remember that "atonement" is a mispronunciation, which has enabled a theological interpretation to obscure its true meaning of at-one-ment — making one — bringing into the unity of the spirit.'

Mr. Housman asserts, however, that traditional Christianity has, for the most part, identified Atonement with Expiation. He writes :

> 'There are to-day a great many Christians who find themselves in revolt against the theological implications of that doctrine. For it implies that God is more independent and separate from the evolving life of the human race than they believe to be possible: that God, at the very beginning of things, gave man a pattern nature, perfect and sinless, from which he fell away, so earning damnation for himself and all his children: it implies that God is an external judge of acts, of law-breakings and disobedience, instead of an internal assessor of the values which these things make or destroy in us: it implies that the Judgment of God comes from outside instead of within. It implies that there is a spiritual life which can be separated from the love of God in torment for all eternity, that souls can continue to exist and be irremediably lost. Those are doctrines, with which the old idea of the Atonement is bound up, in which many can no longer believe.'

Food and The Fall

Another modern exposition of the Fall in the same issue of the *Hibbert Journal* is contributed by Dr. Eisler in an article entitled 'Man into Wolf. An Anthropological Account of the Fall.'

Dr. Eisler treats the Fall of Man not as a theologian nor as a moralist, but as a student of anthropology. Erudition and imagination give liveliness to his exposition. Dr. Eisler regards the Fall as due largely to a change in the diet of primitive man. This will come as no surprise to students of the Yahwist account of the Fall in the Paradise story in Genesis. If Adam and Eve had not eaten of the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge there would have been no Fall of Man. But, as Dr. Eisler sees it, this was not the dietetic change which caused the Fall. It was due to man who was originally frugivorous and vegetarian becoming carnivorous. This change in diet was united to a change in habits and character. As a vegetarian, Primitive Man was of an inoffensive and peaceful disposition. He only fought when compelled to fight in self-defence, and then as a member of his community. Even when fighting his aim was to frighten off his attackers rather than to kill them. But Man became a beast of prey : the bison was transformed into a wolf. This came about, so Dr. Eisler says, when

> 'Man learned by "aping" the habits of gregarious beasts of prey pursuing these early Hominidae, to hunt in common, biting and devouring alive the surrounded and run-down booty.'

Dr. Eisler cites *Genesis* i, 29, in support of his view that Primitive Man was originally herbiverous and frugivorous.

> 'And God said, Behold I have given you every herb yielding seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed to you it shall be for food.'

But Dr. Eisler cites no Biblical passage in support of the change in Man's dietetic habits. He might, however, have cited:

> 'And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Every moving thing that moveth shall be food for you, as the green herb have I given you all' (*Gen.* ix, 3).

It is after this account of Man becoming carnivorous that we have the account of the founding of the earliest human empire by Nimrod, 'the mighty hunter before the Lord.' The Bible, therefore, might be claimed to support Dr. Eisler. We believe, however, that the testimony of the physiologists is against him. Man's dentition indicates that ever since he became Man he has enjoyed a mixed diet. This also is supported by the length of human intestines which come midway between the carnivorous animals and the graminivorous animals. Dr. Eisler's view, however, that Man's food has an important influence on Man's moral habits, should it be generally accepted, may have far-reaching effects, and lead to more of the Parson's functions being discharged by the Physician.

Bernard Shaw, when asking if Modern Man has lost faith, answers:

> 'No! Modern Man has not lost faith, but he has transferred it from the Parsons to the Doctors.'

Perhaps at no distant date the Police Court Physician will co-operate with the Police Court Missionary and both will be consulted by the presiding Magistrate in dealing with the prisoner in the dock. The answer to the question: 'What did this man have for dinner?' will constitute important evidence in assessing the guilt of the prisoner. We know that for several thousand years a vegetarian diet has been prescribed for those who would lead a religious life. All Brahmins are vegetarians, as were many of the Primitive Christian Saints. Whether a carnivorous diet was an important factor in producing Original Sin, we may doubt, even as Anthropologists; but that a carnivorous diet may prove to be a factor in the committing of actual sin is one which perhaps not the Parsons but the Physicians of the future will be called upon to decide. Here we believe we have Samuel Butler with us.

Orthodoxy, Romanism and Zionism

Commander King Hall in his *National News-Letter* of 24th January, 1946, deals with the relations of Church and State in the U.S.S.R.

> 'The attitude of the rulers of the U.S.S.R. towards the Church has passed through two stages and is now in its third stage. The first stage, expressed in the phrase "Religion is the opiate of the people," was militant atheism with all the paraphernalia of anti-God museums and exhibitions and open attacks on the Church. This passed away in due course and the anti-God propaganda died down. It is noteworthy that the early

paganism of the Nazi Movement was also dropped as the years went by, although the Nazi State never relaxed its hostility to those German Churchmen who would not exalt the crooked cross above that of Christ.

'In Russia, the period of indifference or neutrality of the State towards the Church has now been succeeded by one of benevolent interest and support.

'The reasons for this are two. All Governments are interested in whatever influences men's minds, and especially in ideas which command human loyalties. The religious idea is much more real and living to the average Russian peasant than is Marxist doctrine. Secondly, a clash between Church and State in Russia might in the future be a serious business, so the State, while wishing to use the Church politically, is also determined to keep it well under control. This is not difficult, because until quite recently the Church in Russia — we refer to the Orthodox Church—was crushed and broken as a result of its experiences during the period of atheism. However, when Germany attacked Russia a change took place. It culminated on 2nd February, 1945, in the ceremonial enthronement of Alexis as Patriarch of Moscow.

'Stalin was not present, as he had an engagement at Yalta. But the business was done in magnificent style and regardless of expense. More than 150 high dignitaries of the Orthodox Church were invited to Moscow and handsomely entertained. They came from London, Sofia, Bucharest, Athens, Damascus, Alexandria and all over the Balkans and Middle East. When the Patriarchs and Archbishops returned to their Palaces and Cathedrals, some of them took back small packing cases filled with priceless relics and jewelled ikons as a token of communion with Holy Russia. Now what does all this mean?'

Briefly it means that the U.S.S.R. authorities, having persecuted, then protected and patronized the Russian Church, are now using it for propagating on and beyond the Russian frontiers the political policy of the Soviet. This means that the Roman Church, which has been on the offensive in the East for many centuries, is now on the defensive and has suffered the first of what may prove to be a series of ecclesiastical defeats. The defeat has occurred in Ruthenia (a Carpathian province recently ceded to Russia), where the Uniat R.C. Church has forsaken the Papacy and has at the invitation of the new Patriarch of Moscow, the Metropolitan Alexis, returned to the Slav Orthodox fold. The next R.C. defeat will probably take place in the Latin patriarchates of the Middle East (Antioch and Jerusalem).

Russia is deeply concerned to promote the creation of a Zionist State in Palestine, not because it cares for Zionism as such, but because in the literal sense it desires a 'place in the sun,' particularly in the vicinity of the ancient city of the sun (Heliopolis — in modern parlance, the Suez Canal). As our English statesmen have no desire to establish a U.S.S.R. Jewish State in Palestine, the British support of Zionism is on the decline. On the other hand, the U.S.S.R. support, both of Zionism and the Orthodox Church in the Middle East, is bound to reduce the influence and may even imperil the existence of the Latin patriarchate.

Our English prelates are not united in their continental Church policy. The great majority desire cordial relations with the Orthodox Church and intercommunion wherever possible; but a minority of the English episcopate are much more concerned to prepare the way for union with the Papacy and realize that for the English Church to throw itself into the arms of the Orthodox Church will not assist a concordat with Rome. All hope of a Papal concordat with the Orthodox Church having broken down, the Roman Church — owing to its greatly weakened position on the continent, due to the defeat of Fascism—is showing marked cordiality to the Church of England, as it is to the social democratic movement. A bear under the bed makes strange bed-fellows.

Professor Manson and Dr. Cadoux

Professor T. W. Manson has contributed to a volume of essays on *The Interpretation of the Bible* an item which has aroused mixed feelings in the minds of its readers. The Editor of *The Expository Times* (January, 1946) comments as follows:

> 'It is an able presentation of the issue between Liberalism and what Dr. Manson describes as New Testament Christianity. We should not be surprised if this essay became in its own field a classic, and certainly every working minister would find it a fortification of his faith.'

On the other hand, Dr. C. J. Cadoux, in *The Congregational Quarterly* (January, 1946), writes:

> '. . . so far from giving every working minister a fortification of his faith Dr. Manson's Essay is likely to leave the working minister stranded in face of some of those searching questions which the human mind is asking, and will continue to ask, concerning the realities of the Christian religion and the relation of the Scriptures to it.'

Where doctors differ, who shall decide? We must leave it to our readers each to arrive at his own verdict. Let it be noted at the outset that Prof. Manson is a first-class Biblical scholar and that he therefore recognizes that, as Dr. Cadoux writes,

> 'All historical and literary questions are to be frankly faced with the aid of the whole apparatus of critical scholarship.'

But it would appear that Prof. Manson parts from the liberal school when he advocates 'that the scientist and the theologian ought each to pursue his own line independently of the other.' Of this Dr. Cadoux writes:

> 'Theologians cannot ignore other known truth: they must try to synthetize their ideology with it . . .
>
> 'Science has proved that, over a very large area of existence, God has ordained that the regularities we usually know as "Natural Law" shall prevail. Dr. Manson, however, shrinks from any frank recognition of this fact. Throughout his lecture there runs a protest to the effect that this belief in Natural Law was a dogmatic presupposition overhastily

assumed by Liberalism, that it was understood to rule out not only miracles, but all special revelations by God to man, that it erected an impassable and soundproof sheet of plate-glass between man and God, and in short that it made any real revelation and in the end any real religion impossible.'

'It is, however, a mistake to suppose that this acceptance of Natural Law bars God out of His universe or reduces Him to a *roi fainéant*. We feel no difficulty in harmonizing such acceptance, even when it demands room for psychology and for glands, with our personal freedom and with personal intercourse, influence, and responsibility. Why therefore need we suppose that Natural Law rules out personal communication between God and ourselves, such as prayer and special revelation presuppose? Individual Liberals may have existed who drew that inference: but there was no necessity for it, and it was certainly not drawn by Liberals generally. The only stipulation one must make is that any alleged revelation God may grant to men will, like our conversation with one another, almost certainly make use of and conform to the psychological and other laws of our being, which experience increasingly makes known to us.

'These considerations surely suffice to demonstrate the unfairness of disparaging Liberalism on the ground that it involves too much "picking and choosing" among the Biblical material. Dr. Manson condemns excessive and "arbitrary" picking and choosing, such as banishes "all the characteristic flavour of the Biblical teaching." But these are very vague words, and they leave completely unanswered the question as to how we are to distinguish between the right kind of picking and choosing and the wrong. For *some* picking and choosing is incumbent upon us all. The Bible "teaches," for instance, that God hated Esau, that He hardened Pharaoh's heart, that he enjoined the wholesale massacre of civilan populations, that He struck Uzzah dead for his well-meant effort to save the ark from falling, that He "moved David" to number the people and then punished the people for it, and that He said He would pay Nebuchadnezzar and his army with the spoil and captive population of Egypt for their trouble in taking Tyre (*Ezek.* xxix.17-20). I imagine that Dr. Manson, the writer of the "Notes of Recent Exposition" in *The Expository Times,* and indeed most modern Christians, will agree that these statements about God are erroneous. Yet they are just as "biblical" as are *Psalm* xxiii, *Romans* v.8, and *John* iii.16, and contribute just as much to "the characteristic flavour of the Biblical teaching." What then becomes of the blame meted out to Liberalism for "picking and choosing among the Biblical material" to whatever extent the material may require?'

We cannot but feel that Dr. Manson does injustice to Liberal Christian scholars to-day if he charges them with 'the failure of Liberalism to interpret the Bible as the Word of God,' if by that he means that Liberals fail to find in the Bible the Word of God of which mankind is in grievous need to-day. What Liberal scholars have taught us to do is to use those methods of research by which we are enabled to distinguish in the Bible the Word of God from that which is not the Word of God. The methods by which this is done are, we believe, equally accepted by Dr. Manson and Dr. Cadoux, although in certain cases the conclusions at which they arrive differ. The reasons for this difference alleged by

Dr. Manson seem to us to do less than justice to his Liberal Christian brethren.

Darkest Before Dawn

In the eighteenth century Bishop Butler of Durham, and in the nineteenth century Dr. Arnold of Rugby, took the gloomiest view of the prospects of the Church of England. Nevertheless each of these great and good men did his best to redeem the situation and each in his sphere accomplished much. No one, therefore, who takes a gloomy view of the prospects of the Church of England to-day is justified on that account in deserting his post or neglecting his duty. This being taken for granted, we have no hesitation in calling attention to Dr. Hunter's gloomy picture of the religious situation in our great industrial centres. As Bishop of Sheffield, he paints a very dark picture of the situation. The *Guardian* of January 4 thus summarizes the conclusions of an outspoken article by the Bishop published in the *Christian News-Letter*:

> 'The bishop's diagnosis is ruthlessly candid. He notes as something new in history the rise of a large class of people who are quite insensitive to spiritual interests of any kind. They live a mediocre life, following a limited routine, taking their pleasures from the cinema, or the dog-track, and such intellectual stimulus as they need from the headlines of the secular Press. Their interest in politics does not extend beyond the issues which appear to affect wages. "These immense populations are the unresisting product of a machine age, and it is going to be uncommonly hard to get through to any thought or aspiration which might become a hunger for God."
>
> 'But, says the bishop, that is not the whole story. Those who do feel some interest in cultural progress have turned their backs on religion. Spiritual values and the life of prayer are strange to men whose whole intellectual growth has been immersed in mechanical science. A faith so rooted in history as is Christianity, and whose mysticism is so strongly incarnational, will not quickly appeal to those who have no history in their minds.'
>
> 'For a situation like this the old methods of evangelism will be quite inadequate. A long-term policy is plainly needed. We cannot be content to play "the old records with louder needles and more amplifiers," and the plan put forward in some quarters of discrediting "humanism" is bad. "Humanism—the Age-long Lie" was an unhappy caption in the report on *The Conversion of England*.'

The real remedy for the situation is moral and spiritual education both of children and adults. This is a very difficult, arduous and slowly accomplished business. It needs the co-operation of parents and teachers: it needs the union of Christian denominations in this country: it needs also the reformulation of the Christian faith, and a new type of apologetic: it needs also more comprehensible, practical, attractive forms of Christian worship in

our parish churches and cathedrals. All this taken together constitutes a very large order. Moreover, so far as the Church of England is concerned, it may be said to have missed the bus. The demand for Church reunion, the demand for a reformed theology, have been pressed upon the Church for many decades past. At the conclusion of the First World War it seemed as though we were about to secure these things, but ecclesiastical reaction and failure of nerve and energy by the Church's leaders not only checked progress but has led to the depressing situation in which we find ourselves to-day. It may be that the situation will have to become even worse before it can become better. If that be so, the New Reformation will be all the stronger and wiser for its painful preparation.

Modern Churchmen and the Creeds

The Headmaster of Malvern College, Mr. H. G. A. Gaunt, addressing the conference of Educational Associations (as reported in *The Times*, January 1), said in dealing with the Christian vocation of the teacher:

> 'the creeds are unsuitable for our present-day purposes in several ways. First, some of the language is out of date . . . Secondly, the creeds are too difficult and profound for beginners; and, thirdly, they contain only a selection of the great truths of God and man. A short restatement of the fundamentals of the Christian faith, in language appropriate to an affirmation of that faith by modern people, is an urgent need and a major task of the Church.'

Bishop Henson in a letter to *The Times* of January 3 sternly reproved the Headmaster for the temerity and fallaciousness of his plea, and described it as 'mistaken, mischievous and unnecessary.' He wrote:

> 'It is mistaken, because it assumes a false diagnosis of the problem of modern unbelief. The causes lie far deeper than misunderstanding of the "pictorial" language of the creeds. It is mischievous, because it accords with and seems to justify the flimsy pretexts by which those who reject the claim of Christianity are not rarely accustomed to excuse, and even justify, their rejection. It is unnecessary, because instructed Christians find no difficulty, and those who are not yet instructed will have the difficulty explained and removed by competent teachers . . . Moreover, it would add another, and most formidable, factor to the divisive forces which now discredit and enfeeble the Christian Church as a whole.'

Other letters followed in *The Times*, and then the controversy passed into the columns of the *Guardian*.

The Problem of the Creeds is no novelty for Modern Churchmen. In the *Modern Churchman* of February, 1921 (Vol. X, pp. 558-571), we published an editorial article entitled 'The Creed of the Re-united Church,' in which we gave *verbatim* answers from

a number of eminent Modern Churchmen in reply to a *questionnaire*. There were considerable differences in the solutions proposed, but all were conscious that the present use of the Creeds in public worship as modern expressions of the Christian Faith was unsatisfactory, and that something needed doing. Of the answers, Dean Inge's was the briefest:

'I should keep the *Te Deum* and drop the "Three Creeds."'

Before any sound solution of our Creed-problems can be secured, certain fundamental facts about our Creeds have to be realized.

(1) The three Creeds (Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian) preserved and authorized in our English Prayer Book have been selected from a very large body of Christian Creeds. There are some 250 of these Creeds collected in Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*.

(2) Each of our three Prayer Book Creeds is wrongly named. The Apostles' Creed — in the form in which we have it in our Prayer Book — was not composed by the Apostles, but belongs to a much later date. It is the Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church, and the earliest commentary we have on it in our Prayer Book form was composed in the second half of the fourth century. The Nicene Creed in our Service of Holy Communion is not the Creed of the General Council of Nicea held in 325 A.D., but is the Creed set forth by the Council of Constantinople, 381 A.D., and re-authorized by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. Competent scholars (*e.g.* Dr. Hort, Dr. Burns, Prof. Bethune-Baker) regard it as the Baptismal Creed of the Church of Jerusalem. It was probably composed in the fourth century, but how it came to be substituted in 381 A.D. for the original Creed of the Council of Nicaea is an unsolved problem (*cf.* Hort's *Two Dissertations*). The Athanasian Creed was not composed by St. Athanasius who wrote in Greek. It is a Latin metrical composition of the Western Church and originated after 381 A.D.

(3) These three Creeds have great value as dogmatic statements of the Christian Faith, and present their students with a noble and authoritative formulation of that Faith as defined in the second half of the fourth century of the Christian era, the classical era of Creed-making.

(4) The Reformers to whom we owe our Book of Common Prayer state in Article VIII that these Creeds 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' The Church of England, unlike the Church of Rome, has no belief in the Infallibility of the Church; and therefore it does not authorize the Creeds on the

ground that they were put forth by General Councils of the Church. The Creeds authorized are to be accepted in the Church of England because they are in accordance with the statements of Holy Scripture.

(5) Our Church Creeds have three main uses, dogmatic, didactic, devotional. Their dogmatic use is exemplified in two ways. They prescribe the Christian Faith needful for membership in the Christian Church. They also prescribe the Christian Faith which must be held and taught by the authorized Church teacher. Their dogmatic use is exclusive rather than inclusive. They shut the door of Church membership and the teaching office in the Church on those who are unable to make the professions of Christian Faith which the prescribed Creeds require. It ought to be added that in the Church of England very great freedom is permitted both to Church members and to Church teachers in the way in which they interpret the Creeds and in their method of teaching the Faith which the Creeds formulate. In the Church Catechism, the Christian Faith of the laity is thus set forth :

> '*Question.* What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy Belief?
> '*Answer.* First I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me, and all the world.
> Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all mankind.
> Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God.'

In the case of the Clergy, great dogmatic freedom is granted to them by the amended Act of Subscription of 1865. This is explicitly explained by Dean Stanley in his *Essays on Church and State* (*cf.* Essays IV and V) in reference both to the purpose of the Amended Subscription Act, 1865, and the precise terms of the new form of subscription when compared with the old. In view of the great measure of dogmatic freedom possessed by both the English clergy and the English laity, it might seem that it is needless to demand any change either in the wording of our credal formularies or in their use.

Theoretically there is much to be said for this contention, but practically there are great objections to it to-day. The first objection is due to the results of modern Biblical Criticism. When the Creeds were composed and when they were authorized the infallibility of Scripture was the belief of the whole Christian Church. Hence if the statements in the Creeds were in harmony with the statements of Scripture, that was proof positive that they were true. Biblical criticism has made a great difference to this point of view. For instance, the Virgin Birth of Jesus recorded in the

first and third Gospels is not held to be a historical fact by many modern scholars of the Gospels.

A second objection to the present wording of the Creeds is due to the way in which modern science has altered our conception of the Universe and of the Creator's relation to it. The pictorial language of the Creeds could be and was taken literally by Christians generally in the pre-scientific age: to-day this pictorial language seems either childish or misleading, and more so to the educated young person who has to be taught the Christian Faith than to persons of erudition and culture to whom literalism has yielded place to symbolism and mysticism, and for whom — as Dr. Salmon put it — the tune is everything and the words are nothing. Hence modern-minded teachers, like the Headmaster of Malvern College, who have to teach modern-minded youth the Christian Faith, find that the Creeds are not the best vehicles for this purpose. They therefore realize the urgent need for a new formulary in harmony with our modern outlook and our modern needs. Their request seems to us most reasonable and dutiful, particularly as they guard themselves against any charge of desiring to depart from the essential Faith of the Christian Religion. We hope that our Bishops will take steps *at once* to satisfy this demand. Bishop Jeremy Taylor wrote:

> 'Those Creeds are best which keep the very words of Scripture,'

and our Bishops would be well advised to act on the counsel of our English Chrysostom. May we venture to add that brevity is also desirable. The most primitive Baptismal Creed preserved in *Acts* viii, 37, A.V., runs: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.'

Once again we desire to set forth our modern solution of the problem of the Creeds in the Church of England.

We urge (i) That the *Quicunque Vult* be not used in the public Services of the Church, but that it be retained in our Prayer Book and be placed after the Thirty-Nine Articles.

(ii) That the recitation of the Apostles' Creed be omitted from the daily and Sunday Services of the Church, but that it be retained for optional use in our Services of Baptism, and that the Catechism summary of the teaching of the Apostles' Creed be permitted for use as an alternative in the Baptismal Service. If this policy were adopted it would be advisable to retain the Apostles' Creed in the Catechism. The liturgical or devotional recitation of Creeds in church worship is a late introduction, and for many centuries the Baptismal Creed was never recited at any church service except that of baptism. In this way the Apostles' Creed would be restricted to its original use as a Baptismal Creed. We

are, however, unable to advise that the Apostles' Creed should be retained for its other primitive use, the catechising of those who are to be admitted to full membership of the Church. Here we are in agreement with many practical teachers of the Christian Religion to the young, who maintain that the Apostles' Creed to-day is not a good formulary for this purpose, and that something more adequate can and ought to be provided.

(iii) In the interests of historic continuity and catholic unity we urge the retention of the Nicene Creed at the Service of Holy Communion, but we desire the following alterations in its text:

(*a*) That its affirmation of faith be changed from the singular to the plural — 'We believe,' not 'I believe.' This would be a return to the original text of the Creed, and it would emphasize the fact that it is as members of the historic Church that we make this affirmation of its historic Faith.

(*b*) That the *Filioque* clause ('and the Son') be omitted. This again would be a return to the original text of the Creed. The *Filioque* clause was a later insertion, made by a Spanish Provincial Council, and possesses no oecumenical authority. Moreover — and this is very important — the retention of the *Filioque* clause in our 'Nicene' Creed is a very serious cause of separation theologically between the Greek Orthodox Church and ourselves.

(*c*) We would urge that the phrase in our present Nicene Creed 'by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary' be omitted. This clause was not in the original Creed of the Council of Nicaea, which ran thus:

> 'Who for us men and our salvation came down and was incarnate, was made Man, Suffered . . .'

These three emendations in the text of our present Nicene Creed are in no sense modernist innovations, but are all reversions to the original text of the Creed, and all three possess great practical advantages in removing needless causes of offence which militate against Christian unity.

These three emendations do not prevent English Church people from believing in the Double Procession of the Holy Spirit or from affirming it in the Litany and on other occasions: neither do they prohibit belief in the Virgin Birth by English Church people who desire to believe this and to affirm it at the Baptism of their children. What we Modern Churchmen here propose to our Church Authorities seems to us as moderate as it is reasonable. We would add, however, that in churches where the congregation desire the retention of the credal usages prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1662, this ought to be permitted.

> 'In essentials unity: in non-essentials liberty: in all things charity.'

MR. C. S. LEWIS AS AN EVANGELIST

I.

THE writings of Mr. C. S. Lewis have been received with a degree of acclamation almost unique in our time, distinguished literary periodicals vieing with religious papers as diverse as the *Tablet* and the *Congregational Quarterly* in praising his wit, profundity, force, originality and brilliance. In expressing a dissenting opinion, I should like first of all to quote a remark made by Mr. S. L. Bethell in *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition*; although I quarrel with this interesting piece of criticism on several major points, I whole-heartedly concur with the sentiment of the author in his preface:

> 'Criticism is a co-operative function which thrives on controversy. The sharpest disagreement may be in the nature of a compliment: only a bland ignoring of the other person's point of view should bear the stigma of critical bad manners.'

Throughout his religious writing, Mr. C. S. Lewis has announced, in the phrase of Leslie Stephen, that

> 'the old world is once more going to the devil, and that the evil principle, disguised as an angel of intellectual light, is seducing us to close our eyes to all that is elevating and purifying.'

The ingenious method of *The Screwtape Letters*, for example, consists of a series of epistles written from hell by a senior official among the diabolical hierarchy, one Screwtape, to a very junior tempter, Wormwood, who has a certain human 'patient' in his charge. Wormwood is trying, with the aid of the advice of his 'affectionate uncle,' to bring the human being allotted him to moral catastrophe and eventually to the Throne of Our Father Down Below. It is an ingenious method, no more to be slated in itself than Butler's in *Erewhon* or Swift's in *Gulliver*; but it stands or falls, of course, by the use made of it.

What is initially puzzling is the extent to which these devils are intended literally and how far they are mere symbols of the Evil Principle. For we lack the clue given us in *The Problem of Pain*, where Mr. Lewis puts Satan into the Index like any other famous person and ranks him, indeed, between the distinguished Egyptian astronomer, Ptolemy, and the well-known Elizabethan dramatist, William Shakespeare. But two epigraphs and a preface introduce these Letters, and the place for a clue is evidently among them. The first epigraph is from Luther: 'The best way to

drive out the devil, if he will not yield to texts of scripture, is to jeer and flout him, for he cannot bear scorn.' The second is similar, but is from a Catholic writer, the noble martyr Thomas More: 'The devil . . . the prowde spirit . . . cannot endure to be mocked.' In his Preface, Mr. Lewis tells us that

> 'there are two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about the devils. One is to disbelieve in their existence. The other is to believe, and to feel an unhealthy and excessive interest in them.'

But the Father of Protestantism, whose historical greatness is not in question, was grossly superstitious, and he believed in the devil and his angels in the most literal manner. Of a high wind, he said: ''Tis the devil who does this; the winds are nothing else but good or bad spirits'—a remark which might have been made by any Hottentot in Stanley's Darkest Africa. But this is merely fanciful, even charming. Where Luther did damage to a more civilized society is seen in his conception of bodily illness:

> 'Idiots, the lame, the blind, the dumb, are men in whom devils have established themselves, and all the physicians who heal those infirmities as though they proceeded from natural causes are ignorant blockheads who know nothing about the power of the demons.'

I don't suppose for a moment that Mr. Lewis believes this nonsense himself, but it is clear from the foregoing that one of the two writers he has relied upon to introduce his book has fallen into the second error he denounces in his Preface.

Such muddles are, I suppose, inevitable in a work of this character, and my main criticism does not rest upon them; nor am I disputing the limited value of the book as entertaining paradox, in the G.K.C. tradition. But those reviewers, the majority, who saw in *Screwtake* 'a great religious classic' weren't thinking of the entertainment value, except as an added grace; they were thinking of the 'masterly denunciation' of the 'evil principle, disguised as an angel of intellectual light'—and this, too, is the use made of Judas in Miss Dorothy Sayer's radio plays about Christ. There Judas is supposed to be representative of the man who errs from intellectual pride. The jubilation of the more orthodox religious papers over both these curious productions is sufficiently explained.

Mr. Lewis covers his tracks, of course, as he has a perfect right to do. (We cannot accept this covering in *Gulliver* or *Erewhon* and boggle at it in *The Screwtape Letters*.) He warns us in the Preface that 'the devil is a liar' and that 'not everything that Screwtape says should be assumed to be true even from his own angle.' This is fair enough, for the reason stated; but where Mr. Lewis puts into the mouth of his devil some observations he makes

elsewhere, we can be tolerably certain that the views expressed are his own and not the mendacious inventions of the Father of Lies. Sometimes, inevitably, it works the other way round, the implied Truth that contradicts Screwtape's catty observations being similar to Mr. Lewis's postulations in other books. I take but a slight delight in the fact that the malice of Screwtape is couched in exactly the same language (even to 'specially' throughout for 'especially' and the frequent feminine use of the italic phrase) as the radio talks given by Mr. Lewis *in propria persona*. This is not so important as the unconscious dishonesty of the orthodox propaganda which is also common to both.

To take a typical instance from the *Letters*: at one point Screwtape is taking an honest pride in the diabolical achievements of the past eighty years. 'In the last generation,' he says, 'we promoted the construction of a "historical Jesus" on liberal and humanitarian lines. . . . We first make Him solely a teacher, and then *conceal* [my italics] the very substantial agreement between His teachings and those of all other great moral teachers.' I read this latter sentence twice, to see if I had been mistaken at first over the word 'conceal'; but no, 'conceal' is the word used.

We are faced, then, with this alternative: either Mr. Lewis is atrociously ignorant or he is relying on his readers being uninformed. (Unless he has simply been led astray by the sheer delight of controversy.) For he could hardly have opened any book dealing with the unorthodox or historical treatment of Jesus without coming across a passage honestly setting out to prove, by parallel quotations, that not only were the noble teachings of Jesus 'in very substantial agreement' with those of Socrates, Mencius, etc., but that they were, in many cases, almost word for word the same. Mr. Lewis may, of course, as honestly believe that the world, save for the orthodox mind, is rapidly descending to the Throne of Our Father Down Below; but he goes almost out of his way to convince the sceptical reader that he is simply using the Church as an excuse for his dreary attacks on everything he hasn't bothered to understand. The *Letters* are full of vague references to Liberalism, Humanitarianism, the Life-Force, Modern Art, the Historical Point of View, Psycho-analysis, Progress, etc., all asserted to have their origin in the Evil Principle and to be winning over humanity to the devil in the guise of angels of intellectual light. This is what the reviewers are referring to when they say of Mr. Lewis's work in general (or of Miss Sayers's) that it 'traverses so many glibly repeated modern opinions' or 'clears away a mass of shoddy assumption.' They haven't stopped to think, these reviewers, whether to make a sneer do the work of a

demonstration is not pretty 'glib' in itself, or whether it is not a 'shoddy assumption' to present the case against orthodoxy in a conveniently vague manner which leads to misrepresentation or as a mere reversal of the truth. What those ecclesiastics, who recommended *Screwtape* as eminently suited for the unorthodox mind, were thinking of, I don't quite know; for it should be clear enough that no conversion is likely to arise in the mind of one who is told that the whole of the unorthodox case springs from the Devil or that Evil Principle in which (by definition) he doesn't believe.

It will be observed throughout the Letters that Mr. Lewis makes great play with the vagueness of the unorthodox ('hazy ideas of Progress and Development,' etc.), but the charge itself remains vague and is not demonstrated, and Mr. Lewis puts nothing in its place except the War of God against the Devil and 'the plain antithesis between True and False.' Let us take the first of these and see what we can make of it. The spectacle presented throughout this book of mankind being a battleground on which the Trinity and the diabolical host fight things out, is not only incredibly childish but bears the strongest relation to the myths of primitive races. No wonder Mr. Lewis, with his head full of melodrama, sneers at the Historical Point of View, no wonder he despises the studies of the anthropologists! Some of these men were Christians themselves: according to his biographer, the late A. C. Haddon was 'a regular churchgoer,' and he probably agreed with George Eliot when she exclaimed, 'What pitiable people those are who see no poetry in Christianity!' The poetry is certainly there; it is not an accident that unorthodox writers like Chateaubriand, Flaubert, Dostoievsky, Tolstoy, D. H. Lawrence, T. F. Powys have had their imaginations fired by the noble story of the Gospels.

But that part of Christianity, the noble, the civilized part, is not the part stressed by Mr. Lewis, either in this book or in his radio talks or in his *Problem of Pain*. He seems hardly aware that the noble part exists, and then only to poke fun at it as 'Christianity-and-water.' What Mr. Lewis stresses in *Screwtape* is 'the despair and horror and astonishment' of the damned souls, and the last Letter is enough to make the most headstrong child look under the bed at night; but whether any educated person approves of such appeals to primitive emotion is another matter. We are not told, as I say, how much of this is intended in the literal or Lutheran sense: but something of the attitude Mr. Lewis takes up (or strikes) is apparent from a passage in *Broadcast Talks*:

> 'When you go to church you're really listening in to the secret wireless from our friends: that's why the enemy is so anxious to prevent us going. He does it by playing on our conceit and laziness and intellectual

snobbery. I know someone will ask me, "Do you really mean, at this time of day, to re-introduce our old friend the devil—hoofs and horns and all? *Well, what the time of day has to do with it, I don't know.* [My italics.] And I'm not particular about the hoofs and horns. But in other respects my answer is "Yes, I do."'

The primitive emotions in early and mediaeval Christianity (an 'intellectual snob' might tell Mr. Lewis) have been refined by civilization, and nothing valuable or respectable is gained by making a deliberate return to them. As Mr. Middleton Murry says in *The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches*, 'The same large process of exploration by which the extent of the world was quadrupled, and Christianity was brought into contact with ancient civilizations and mature religions, also debilitated the crudely material belief in an after-life and after-judgement on which the authority of the mediaeval Christian Church was founded.' And Mr. Murry goes on to say that the 'new Christianity' in which he believes as the one hope for the future will have to be 'a Christianity that is new, less in relation to the comprehensive orthodoxy of the thirteenth century—in admiration of which I yield to no man—than in relation to the primitive and magical belief on which was based the factual authority of the mediaeval Church.'

'This simple distinction,' as Murry says, 'is important.' It is supremely important for my immediate purpose, neatly answering as it does Mr. Lewis's preposterous remark, 'What the time of day has to do with it, I don't know.' There were many things that were fine in mediaeval Christianity, but they were bound up with that 'primitive and magical belief' which has disappeared with the progress of civilization. This is not a 'hazy idea' to anyone save Mr. Lewis and his reviewers; it is a fact of history, verified by the best Catholic historians such as Acton and Mr. Christopher Dawson. So far from writing a book 'which will most certainly become a great religious classic' (as the *Record* said of *The Screwtape Letters*), Mr. Lewis has, like Ambrose Applejohn, ordered the main deck to be thrown overboard. For if Christianity loses its poetic appeal, it loses everything. The childish melodrama which Mr. Lewis stages (he makes great play with military metaphor) is fit only for the perverse.

II.

'You're not children,' said Mr. Lewis at the beginning of his third series of broadcast talks, printed under the title of *Beyond Personality*; 'You're not children: why should you be treated like children?' Everyone will agree with this statement; but some of those who listened to this series of talks, or to the earlier two, *Broadcast Talks* and *Christian Behaviour*, will wonder why Mr.

Lewis fell so often into the error he so rightly denounces. Consider this passage, for example, from *Christian Behaviour*:

> 'There's a story about a schoolboy who was asked what he thought God was like. He replied that, as far as he could make out, God was "the sort of person who is always snooping round to see if anyone is enjoying himself and then trying to stop it." And I am afraid that is the sort of idea that the word Morality raises in a good many people's minds; something that interferes, something that stops you having a good time.'

Now, that is exactly similar to the talks given at the end of Children's Hour Prayers; and the vast majority of Mr. Lewis's radio addresses are on the same deliberately childish level. In *Broadcast Talks* he apes the 'muscular padré': 'There's been a great deal of soft soap talked about God for the last hundred years,' he tells us brutally. 'That's not what I'm offering. You can cut all that out.' Yet these radio addresses have been most enthusiastically received; the *Church Times* asserted of *Christian Behaviour* that 'their lucidity and direct simplicity place them within the reach of the Confirmation candidate and the mature philosopher alike.' The Confirmation candidate possibly, but if mature philosophers are enlightened by being told, for instance, that 'God is no fonder of intellectual slackers than of any other slackers,' then the present condition of Philosophy is one which I don't like to contemplate. And is this directed to mature minds:

> 'Our experience is coloured through and through by books and plays and the cinema, and it takes patience and skill to disentangle the things we have really learned from life for ourselves. . . . One thing people get from books is the idea that if you have married the right person you may expect to go on "being in love" for ever.'

The first part of that quotation is an appeal to the gross prejudice which attempts to separate literature from life, to the contrary of which can be adduced the remarks of most of the great poets, novelists and critics. We feel a faint suspicion when Mr. Lewis equates the cinema with books, and, in the second half of the quotation, it becomes evident which books he is referring to—he is referring, obviously, to the novels of Ethel M. Dell and others of the same kind. His statement is certainly true of that sort of literature, but do 'mature philosophers,' or mature minds generally, *read* that sort? The two parts of the quotation taken together seem to indicate that Mr. Lewis, a lecturer in English literature at Oxford University, is not aware of the differences between good literature and bad—one of which is precisely that relation to life which he has indicated. And this is not even the result of his popular approach; for another book, *Rehabilitations*, addressed mainly to a university audience, not only takes an equal delight with *Screwtape* in disparaging opponents who remain equally vague ('our modern impostors,' 'the new Puritanism,' etc.),

but asserts that the Best-Sellers of to-day, naming Buchan and Wodehouse, may be 'classics for the intelligentsia of the twenty-third century' before literature of the kind represented by T. S. Eliot. . . .

But it is an axiom in literary criticism that an author should be judged by his best works, or the best parts of them. There is therefore no point in covering pages with proofs of Mr. Lewis's deliberate childishness in these radio talks, now that we have demonstrated that his advice to himself was not so regarded and that his childishness was not due to his popular approach. It is better to go on from this to a discussion of those parts of his radio addresses which deserve, or seem to deserve, to be taken seriously by everyone. The first thirty pages of *Broadcast Talks*, for instance, show Mr. Lewis at his best, presenting a popular audience with ideas about the Moral Law, etc., in a largely reasonable manner and expressing himself with decent impartiality. But, alas! he has learned from Chesterton the technique of the false analogy. Here it pops up in all its slightly faded glory as Mr. Lewis quotes a letter from a listener ('Three hundred years ago people in England were putting witches to death. Was that what you call the Rule of Human Nature or Right Conduct?') and comments:

> 'Surely the reason we don't execute witches is that we don't believe there are such things. If we did — if we really thought that there were people going about who had sold themselves to the devil and received supernatural powers from him in return and were using these powers to kill their neighbours or drive them mad or bring bad weather — surely we'd all agree that if anyone deserved the death penalty, then these filthy quislings did? There's no difference of moral principle here: the difference is simply about matter of fact. It may be a great advance in *knowledge* not to believe in witches: there's no moral advance in not executing them when you don't think they are there! You couldn't call a man humane for ceasing to set mouse-traps if he did so because he believed there were no mice in the house.'

A prime bit of G.K.C., that analogy! But there is something more seriously wrong with this passage, plausible as it sounds. Mr. Lewis hasn't bothered to think whether 'moral advance' is so separated from 'knowledge' as he implies here. Apart from the particular fact that hundreds of intelligent Christian people didn't agree with the death-penalty for witches three hundred years ago, there is the general historical fact that the growth of knowledge has always affected the moral code. The morality of primitive tribes was founded upon their primitive knowledge of the world and of themselves; 'witches three hundred years ago' were a relic of primitive superstition, and whether orthodox Christianity favoured this survival is an open question — I can't see much

difference, myself, between a belief in witches and a belief in a diabolical intelligence. Mr. Lewis, in fact, goes on to that passage about the 'horned devil' (not on the Mappin Terrace) which I quoted in my first section. If that penny-dreadful is a suitable thing for 'the mature philosopher,' then I'd sooner have the 'Christianity-and-water' which Mr. Lewis pokes so much fun at; I think, personally, it's preferable to Christianity-and-ginger-beer.

Mr. Lewis then proceeds to made a derogatory use of the achievements of anthropology (similar to a celebrated passage in Chesterton's *Doubts of Democracy*); he cannot altogether deny their case, but he can, and does, limit it. He talks of 'queer stories' in pagan religions in the same breath almost as he talks of 'the queer twist' about Christianity which persuades him it is the Truth. If one of the reasons why Mr. Lewis believes in the orthodox Faith is the 'queer twist' about it ('it's not the sort of thing that anyone would have made up'), why should so much cheap patronage be extended to those who have doubtless made that one of the reasons for their belief in pagan 'queer stories'? To assert dogmatically that Mr. Lewis is here very muddled is our obvious reaction, but I can't rid myself of the impression that he needn't have been, that it would have been easy for him to have presented his orthodox case in a straightforward manner, but that he succumbed to Chesterton's temptation to have a bang at all these stupid 'unbelievers,' not realizing that his case against them could be turned logically against himself.

He next comes to Jesus:

> 'Either this man was, and is, the Son of God: or else a madman or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But don't let us come with any patronising nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He hasn't left that open to us. He didn't intend to.'

Not everyone will find this self-conscious 'plain speaking' impressive. Mr. Lewis is very fond of that 'either . . or . .' formula, but here it only applies to those who accept the New Testament as being throughout the very Word of God. From that point of view he is correct, but the silly and patronizing people referred to (such as Tolstoy) don't accept the New Testament in that way—so Mr. Lewis's scorn is directed against nobody at all. Even an orthodox, and very learned, Roman Catholic scholar like Dom Basil Butler can write in the *Dublin Review*:

> 'However authentic the New Testament documents may be, it remains true that the authenticity of some at least of them is disputed by a large number of authoritative modern scholars. They are, moreover, brief in themselves; there is overlapping among them; and we have no security whatever that they preserve an adequate record. . . .'

Butler, of course, holds that this doesn't matter a great deal, that History cannot support the burden of Faith, etc. I think this is a most reasonable view; at any rate, there is not the unconsciously dishonest muddle of history and theology that we get in Mr. Lewis (compare the Introduction to *The Man Born to be King*) with his bluster about 'You must make your choice.' The choice, being based entirely (except for Faith) on documents which have been argued over and disputed 'by a large number of authoritative modern scholars,' is not a real choice, any more than that offered to us by the public-school-Marxists in the 'thirties.

I think personally that Mr. Lewis's three series of radio talks have done a grave disservice to European civilization, of which Christianity at its finest has formed a very important part. Consider, for instance, the implications of this passage from *Beyond Personality* :

> 'When you get down to it, isn't the popular idea of Chrsitianity just this? That Jesus Christ was a great moral teacher and that if only we took his advice we might be able to establish a better social order and avoid another war? Now, mind you, that is quite true. But it tells you very *little* about Christianity, and it has no *practical* importance at all. . . We never have followed the advice of the great teachers. Why are we likely to begin now?'

This is as much as to say that the world would have been the same if Plato, Aristotle, Confucius and Jesus (the four teachers mentioned by Mr. Lewis) had never existed. But the civilization for which the majority of the world has recently been fighting is based directly upon those doctrines which Mr. Lewis thinks of no *practical* importance.

R. C. Churchill.

ADVANCE OR RETREAT IN SOUTH INDIA

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A., B.D., Canon of Nagpur.

FOR nearly a quarter of a century, negotiations have been going on in South India for organic reunion between three bodies in that area: (i) 'The [Anglican] Church of India, Burma and Ceylon,' (ii) the Methodist Church in South India, and (iii) 'the South India United Church,' which comprises congregations that were formerly Presbyterian or Congregationalist. These negotiations have at length resulted in *The Scheme of Church Union in South India* (7th edition, revised), which has now been formally accepted by two out of the three bodies concerned. It was 'adopted' by the General Council of the Anglican Church held at Nagpur in January 1945, and two years before that it was approved by the South India Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church. The South India United Church, however, has deferred the final decision of its General Assembly till 1946, so that meanwhile the ultimate fate of the Scheme still hangs in the balance.

The bulk of the negotiations have been carried on within 'the Joint Committee on Church Union in South India,' which comprises delegates from all the Churches concerned, including (of course) the Anglican. In the earlier stages, the members of the Committee seem to have been intensely conscious of a great spiritual tide of enthusiasm, which enabled them to surmount many difficulties and to make greater progress than they could have dared to hope for. In the last few years, however, the atmosphere has evidently changed. The supreme assemblies of the three Churches have been urging their delegates to press their own denominational claims; and the result has been a tendency to bargaining, and an atmosphere of mutual coolness, if not suspicion, which has created what a writer in the *Church Union* magazine[1] for September 1943 called 'the Winter of our Discontent.'

The minorities which have been opposed to the Scheme have always been considerable — more so, I think, than Church-people in England have generally recognized. Enthusiastic supporters of the Scheme have sometimes tended to picture the issue as a 'straight fight' between a small body of die-hard Anglo-Catholics and the rest of the Church, or between a united body of Indian Christian opinion and the conservatism of a few British chaplains

[1] Published in Madras, to promote the cause of Church Reunion in South India.

and missionaries. Neither of these estimates is altogether correct. It is true that within the Anglican Communion the most vociferous opponents of the Scheme have been Anglo-Catholics, especially those who tend to identify 'the Voice of the Church' with the voice of the *Church Times*. But it must not be forgotten that among the chief supporters of the Scheme have been men whose sympathies were definitely 'Catholic' rather than 'Protestant,' such as Bishop Palmer (late of Bombay) and Bishop Foss Westcott of Calcutta (late Metropolitan of India). Moreover, on the Free Church side, the opposition to the Scheme has been led by staunch Protestants such as Mr. Devasahayam and Mr. Chenchiah, who have denounced it as a betrayal of Protestant principles and a craven surrender to Anglicanism. The fact that these two are Indians also reminds us that Indian Christian opinion is far from united in support of the Scheme; though here again it is true that, within the Anglican Communion, Indians are almost unanimous in its favour. I believe, however, that the late Bishop Waller of Madras was right when he admitted that the reason why the majority of Indian Christians support the Scheme is, not that they are enamoured of it in itself (indeed, most of them have only the vaguest idea of its content), but that they are intensely conscious of the weakening effect of our Western denominational divisions upon the witness of the Church in India, and are desperately anxious (both for religious and political reasons) to present a United Christian Front to the world in which they live. Consequently, they are prepared to support any scheme which offers them a prospect of ending at least some of their 'unhappy divisions.'

The figures at the final voting on the Scheme at the General Council of our Church in January 1945 show that the minorities which voted 'No' in each of the Houses were by no means negligible, *viz.*:

In the House of	Laity ...	7 out of 38	Total, 21 out of 96.[2]
,, ,,	Clergy ...	10 out of 48	
,, ,,	Bishops ..	4 ,, 10	

In the South India United Church the opposition appears to be even stronger; for up to September 1944 three out of their eight Councils had refused to accept the Scheme; and of the five that

[2] Moreover, the wording of the Resolution on which this vote was taken was significantly cautious. It began by re-affirming that the Church of the Province continues to be bound by its old constitution, but 'adopts' the Scheme in order to permit the four South Indian Dioceses to carry out their practically unanimous desire for Reunion. This was a revised draft of the original Resolution, and was made in order to meet the objections of those who felt they could not 'approve,' or even 'accept,' the Scheme, but were willing to 'adopt' it, so long as the *onus* was thrown upon the South Indian Dioceses—which (be it noted) will thereby be 'permitted to leave' the Anglican Communion. — Not a very *cordial* blessing on the new venture!

had accepted it, two expressed hesitation and asked for modifications of the Scheme in a Protestant direction.[3]

It should also be borne in mind that several of the largest Churches in South India have all along refused to enter into these negotiations at all — notably the Lutheran and Baptist Churches, the Syrian Churches of Travancore (both Reformed and Orthodox), and (of course) the Church of Rome; so that in any case the Scheme would not unite all Christians, or even all Protestant Christians, in South India into one organized Church.

We have drawn attention to these facts in order to shew that the opposition to the Scheme, from many sides, is formidable, and cannot be lightly dismissed. This has, indeed, always been recognized by its promoters in India; and in order to try and conciliate the opposition; the Scheme has been modified again and again. Ingenious 'formularies' have been devised in the hope that all parties would be able to assent to them verbally, even if placing on them interpretations of exceeding great diversity. Eventually, as we have seen, the 7th Edition of the Scheme, put forward by the Joint Committee, has been authoritatively accepted by the Anglicans and Methodists in South India, and will come before the South India United Church for final acceptance or rejection in 1946.

What is likely to happen then? Since the Scheme was adopted by the General Council of our Church in India last January, certain developments have taken place which may well cause serious misgivings in the minds of all, whether Anglicans or Free Churchmen, who value the principles of Liberal and Evangelical Christianity. Especially is this the case with regard to the 'Pledge of mutual respect of consciences.' The exact meaning of this Pledge has long been a matter of dispute. It runs as follows:[4]

> 'Every presbyter of the Church of South India may minister and celebrate the Holy Communion in any Church of the United Church, and is eligible to be appointed to any charge therein. . . . One essential condition of complete unity is that all members of the Church should be able and willing to receive Communion equally in all its Churches.'

This general principle is, however, qualified by the following proviso:

> 'The Church of South India pledges itself that it will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience, either by Church authorities or by majorities, and will not in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed. Neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed, or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation.'

[3] See the Rev. J. E. L. Newbigin's article, 'The S.I.U.C. and the Scheme,' in *Church Union* for March, 1945.

[4] *Constitution of the Church of South India*, II, 13.

Now, taking the Pledge and the Proviso together, what do they mean in practice? One interpretation (and, I venture to think, the most natural) is that which has been authorized by the Joint Committee; namely, that in the United Church any minister (whether episcopally or non-episcopally ordained) may be appointed to any congregation (ex-episcopal or ex-non-episcopal) provided that the congregation welcomes the appointment and no objection is raised by them. Thus, *freedom* to appoint is the *normal* principle of the Church, and *refusal* to appoint is the *exception*, only in the event of objections being raised. This interpretation was adopted by the Joint Committee in 1934, and was re-affirmed by them in November 1944, with a request that in future editions of the Scheme it should be printed as a Note at the end of Part I.[5] There is no indication that the Anglican representatives on the Joint Committee dissented from these recommendations.[6]

A different interpretation of the Pledge was, however, put forward in 1943 by Archbishop William Temple, in a Charge to Canterbury Convocation, when he stated that his personal interpretation of the Pledge was that a non-episcopal minister could *not* be appointed to the charge of an ex-Anglican congregation, 'except in the rarest circumstances' (*e.g.* 'the case of a congregation of very simple converts left without a minister through the death of their own pastor').[7] It will be seen that this interpretation *reverses* that of the Joint Committee: for it makes *refusal* to appoint a non-episcopal minister to be the *normal* rule of the Church, and *freedom* to appoint him the *exception*.

Now in June 1945 (six months after the 'adoption' of the Scheme by the General Council of the Anglican Church in India) the Bishops of that Church, assembled in Synod, officially endorsed Archbishop Temple's interpretation by passing the following resolution:

> 'That except in cases of extreme pastoral urgency, an ex-Anglican congregation is, under the Pledge, prevented from being placed in the charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister.'[8]

Now, what is likely to be the effect of this upon the future of

[5] See *Church Union*, December, 1944.

[6] One of the Anglican members of the Joint Committee has written to me (under date October 28th, 1945): 'No attempt was ever made to push through in that committee the narrower interpretation of the Pledge, now sponsored by the Bishops.'

[7] See *Church Union*, June, 1943.

[8] The Synod also affirmed: (i) That no resolution of the Joint Committee has any binding authority on the Church [of India] until it has been accepted by that Church; and (ii) That the Church of India is not committed by its adoption of the Scheme to the doctrine of the equality of all ministries.

(The resolutions of the Synod will be found in the *Record* newspaper (London) of July 20th, 1945.)

the Scheme? So far as the Methodists are concerned, there have already been indications that they will firmly refuse to accept the Bishops' interpretation of the Pledge. For when this interpretation was put forward by Archbishop Temple in 1943, it was challenged by the Rev. C. H. Monahan, Senior Missionary of the Methodist Church in South India, who, only three days after the publication of the Archbishop's charge in the Indian Press, wrote as follows to the *Madras Mail* :*

> 'The interpretation given (by the Archbishop) is completely out of date.' Then, after referring to the other interpretation, endorsed by the Joint Committee, he proceeds : 'In 1943, the South India Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church recorded its approval of the Scheme on the basis of this [the Joint Committee's] interpretation, to which specific reference was made. May I state, quite firmly and definitely, that the Scheme to which Methodism in South India has given its approval carries with it the complete equality of all ministers in the United Church. Union on such terms as the Archbishop suggests would be unhesitatingly rejected by the Methodist Church.'

Mr. Monahan's letter was not an official pronouncement of the Methodist Church; but it expressed the opinion of one of the most experienced and sober-minded Methodist leaders in India. That his view would be endorsed by many other influential Methodists is, I think, certain. The present writer has recently received a letter, dated Sept. 9th, from one of the most influential Methodist supporters of the Scheme in South India, in which he says :

> 'The Bishops' resolutions have created a most unfortunate impression. . . . They acted as they did, evidently without the faintest idea of the storm they were raising. . . . I can quite plainly say that in a vote on the Scheme with this statement of Anglican thought included, I should join the opposition.'

So far as the South India United Church is concerned, I am not aware that any official pronouncement has yet been made. But the *South India United Church Herald* of August 9th, 1945, commenting on the Bishops' resolutions, describes them as a 'bomb-shell'; and a leading layman of the South India United Church, writing in the Madras *Guardian* of Oct. 11th, 1945, concludes a long aritcle on 'South India Church Union and the House of Bishops' with these words : 'These resolutions of the House of Bishops have definitely made Church Union in South India impossible of attainment.'

In short, there is every indication that the Bishops' resolutions will meet with a very hostile reception in the other negotiating Churches; and there is at least a possibility that this may end in the final rejection of the Scheme by the South India United Church, and may also lead the Methodists to reconsider their 1943 vote of acceptance.

* May 29th, 1943.

Now, if the long negotiations for Church Union should end in failure along these lines, it will be evident to all Christendom that Anglo-Catholicism has once more scored a great triumph. For no one, I think, can doubt that the episcopal resolutions of June 1945 were an attempt to appease Anglo-Catholic agitation against the Scheme, which has continued ever since the adoption of the Scheme by the General Council of the Church of India.

It would seem as if a chapter of Church history twenty-five years ago were now repeating itself. For when, in 1920, the Bishops assembled at Lambeth issued their 'Appeal to all Christian People,' this struck so generous a note towards the non-episcopal Churches that hopes of Reunion rose high. But at once the Anglo-Catholics started an agitation; and the Bishops, yielding to the clamour, began to sound notes of caution and misgiving. The result is that to-day 'we are further away from reunion than we were a quarter of a century ago.'[10]

One thing is certain: if the Bishops' resolutions of June 1945 are the 'last word' of Anglicans on this subject, the Anglican Communion will stand committed, more deeply than ever before, to the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Church, ministry, and sacraments. And on such a basis the prospects of Reunion between ourselves and the Free Churches recede into an indefinitely remote future.

Is this a prospect which any Liberal or Evangelical Churchman can view without concern? Some of us (among whom the present writer would reckon himself) have in the past doubted whether it was wise to attempt to inaugurate the Scheme as it stands until further 'spade-work' had been done in the way of practical co-operation, both in worship and public service, between the Churches concerned. We regretted the stipulation that the four Dioceses joining in the Scheme *must* at the same time sever their membership of the Anglican Communion — a step which would involve loss both for them and for their brethren from whom they have to separate. It seemed to us that if the Scheme is worthy of 'adoption' by our Church, those participating in it ought not thereby to be deprived of any of the privileges they have formerly enjoyed as members of our Communion. We considered that the minorities opposed to the Scheme were too large to be simply overridden. Above all, we viewed with serious misgivings the use of formularies, such as the 'Pledge' or 'the Historic Episcopate,' which are obviously interpreted by the consenting parties in widely different (if not, indeed, mutually contradictory) ways; and we

[10] Sir Cyril Norwood's presidential address at the Oxford Conference of Modern Churchmen; see the *Modern Churchman*, September, 1945, p. 108.

foresaw herein seeds of future disagreement, misunderstanding, and recrimination. Recent developments have, I think, shewn that these misgivings were not without justification.

But however this may be, now that the Scheme *has* been adopted by our Church, its shipwreck on the rock of the Bishops' resolutions could only bring what we would regard as reaction; and the best way of advance towards a unity such as we desire lies along the lines of a courageous acceptance of the Scheme and its administration on liberal and generous lines.

What then does the present situation require from us? In the first place, it is essential to make clear to the authorities of the Church that Anglo-Catholics are not the only people who have deep convictions on the issues at stage. The majority of our bishops are anxious above all things to avoid the danger of rupture within the Church; and as long as they are confronted on the one hand by a determined group of Anglo-Catholics who say with evident conviction, '*We will never consent to this!*'; and on the other hand by groups of Moderate, Liberal, and Evangelical Church-people who say mildly, '*Please* do not do this!' they will continue to yield to the former rather than to the latter. But if they knew that in the event of the failure of the present negotiations a large body of Church-people, clergy and laity, will feel themselves in conscience bound to go forward in co-operation and worship with the Free Churches—and be prepared to take the consequences, as courageously as Anglo-Catholics have taken the consequences of *their* unauthorized actions in the past—then I believe that the episcopal policy towards reunion would undergo a drastic change.

Side by side with this need for greater courage in action, there is also, I think, need for a larger charity on the part of the supporters of the Scheme. Some of these have shewn a tendency to ride rough-shod over all objections, and to dismiss all misgivings as 'mere narrow-mindedness.' They have failed to recognize that as long as men (not all of them ignorant or fanatical) *do* hold the Anglo-Catholic conception of the Church, it is not 'narrow-mindedness' for them to refuse to compromise on this issue; on the contrary, it would indicate 'muddle-headedness' on their part to agree. It is for us to act up to our principles, rather than to urge them to violate theirs.

There is much more that might be added with regard to the present situation of the Church Union Movement in South India; but perhaps sufficient has been said to indicate, on the one hand, the seriousness of the present crisis, and, on the other hand, the need for clear and sympathetic understanding, as well as for wise and courageous action.

SIR THOMAS MORE'S LETTER TO BUGENHAGEN

By Professor E. F. Rogers.

EVEN in the first years of the Continental Reformation, much of the Lutheran pamphlet literature was brought into England. This literature harmonized with the interests of English heretics and with the survival of Wyclifite heresy. It was brought quickly, too, as we learn when a heresy case lists the books discovered and includes the most recent German publications.

Sir Thomas More's deep piety and sincere loyalty to the Catholic Church made him immediately concerned at this attack on religious creed and life. His diplomatic missions brought him opportunities of acquaintance with leading Churchmen at home and abroad, and the resulting correspondence must often have discussed the problems resulting from this attack on the Church. As early as 1521, Erasmus wrote to Pace of More's letters on the subject (not now extant) written in July of that year during his service in Bruges.[1] When Luther attacked Henry VIII for his *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments*, More wrote a long defence of the King's position, under the pseudonym of Gulielmus Rosseus. Even short tracts did not escape More's attention and their significance was keenly appreciated.

One of these short tracts was Bugenhagen's *Epistola Sanctis qui sunt in Anglis*, which was published in 1525. It was written because Bugenhagen had heard that Evangelical teaching was not accepted by many in England, and that evil reports were circulated by Luther's opponents, asserting that lax morals and variety of doctrine were true of the Lutherans. The tract was brief and simple, but it carried weight because of the personal respect in which Bugenhagen was held and because of his position as pastor of the city church in Wittenberg.

Bugenhagen was a Pomeranian by birth, educated at the University of Greifswald, and ordained to the priesthood about 1509. He was an accurate Classical scholar and under the influence of Erasmus' works began a close study of the Bible, and gave public lectures on St. Matthew, the Epistles to Timothy, and the Psalms. He was shocked by his first reading of the *Babylonian Captivity*,

[1] Allen IV, Ep. 1218, i, 46; and Vives to Erasmus of 13 November 1524, Allen V, 1513, i, 15*f*.

but on re-reading agreed with its point of view. He wrote to Luther, who replied and sent him the *Liberty of a Christian Man*. Desiring to know Luther personally, he moved to Wittenberg, matriculated in the University, and had some intercourse with Luther before he was summoned to the Diet of Worms. Again he lectured publicly on the Psalms and won the confidence and admiration of Melancthon. He supported Melancthon against Carlstadt and the Zwickau prophets during Luther's absence at the Wartburg. In October 1522 he married Eva, the sister of Georg Rörer. In the following year he became pastor of the city church, unanimously elected by the Senate of the University and the Council of the city. Here he was most closely associated with Luther and Melanchthon, and was Luther's confessor and colleague.[2] Like Luther, he wished changes to be made very slowly. For these changes he had wisdom and administrative ability.

More had, then, no mean antagonist to answer. His reply to this brief tract is a pamphlet of some 12,000 words. It was evidently intended for publication, but was laid aside, perhaps because of greater interest in the later English controversies. It was published at Louvain in 1568 by John Fowler, an English exile, who printed from More's manuscript, found probably among the papers in the possession of his father-in-law, John Harris, once More's secretary.[3] The title includes Fowler's comment that More replies 'no less facetiously than piously,' and in one margin Fowler adds *facete*, lest we miss More's humour by our stupidity.

More wrote this time in Latin, as Bugenhagen had done. His sentences are often long and involved, and there are unnecessary repetitions in his argument. His method is to quote a sentence or short paragraph from Bugenhagen, and then answer it. He is scrupulously fair to his opponent in the accuracy of his quotations and in full appreciation of the force of his arguments. His style is easy and popular, and full of brilliant, sharp, sarcastic, humorous thrusts. Some passages are scurrilous, and comments on the marriages of Bugenhagen, Lamber and Luther are too bitter and scathing to quote. More used his letter to Bugenhagen as his reply to the whole Lutheran movement as far as it had then progressed.

His preparation for this task was good. The Jesuit, Stapleton, whose biography of More was published in 1588, tells us that he found More

> 'to have been a most diligent student of the Holy Scriptures, and to have had a considerable acquaintance with the Fathers and even with the dis-

[2] Karl Vogt, *Johannes Bugenhagen Pomeranus*; Bugenhagen's *Briefwechsel*, ed. O. Vogt; Kawerau's article in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopädie*.

[3] Bridgett, *Blessed Thomas More*, p. 218n.; De Vocht, *Epistolae ad Franciscum Craneveldium*, Ep. 115, introd.

> putes of the Schools. . . . When he speaks of grace, free will, merit, faith, charity and other virtues, original sin and even predestination, he is so guarded and exact in his statements that a professional theologian could scarcely speak more accurately.'[4]

He uses, for very apt quotation in his discussion with Bugenhagen, passages from Deuteronomy, Kings, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the four Gospels, first Corinthians, first Thessalonians, first Timothy, James, and the Apocalypse. Of the controversial literature of this period, to date, he had read Luther's *Babylonian Captivity*, the *Address to the Christian Nobility*, his tracts on *The Holy Cross in Churches* and on *Marriage*, Erasmus' *Diatribe on Free Will*, and Luther's *Bondage of the Will.*

The question of how he received information about events in Germany is less easy to answer. The writer of the article, 'Sir Thomas More and the Reformation,' probably Seebohm, in the North British Review for 1859, says that More's correspondent was Cochlaeus. But a study of the dates shows that they were not then acquainted. The *Epistle to Bugenhagen* was not dated, but must, from internal evidence, have been written in 1526. It was not until 25 August 1527 that Erasmus wrote to congratulate Cochlaeus[5] on gaining More's friendship. Cochlaeus was at that time 'making advances to many English statesmen' and was soon after writing to Erasmus to request him to write against the Anabaptists. He made the same request to Bishop Fisher of Rochester.[6]

The late Dean Hutton considered More's correspondent to be Goclenius.[7] The acquaintance began with Erasmus' introduction of Goclenius to More in 1520.[8] Their extant correspondence for this period, however, does not prove the point. Whoever his correspondent was, More's visits abroad in 1520, 1521, probably 1523,[9] would allow him to know the reports in the Netherlands. In any case, his information is detailed, bitterly opposed to Lutheranism and anxious as to the results of such disloyalty to the Church.

Bugenhagen's *Epistola Sanctis qui sunt in Anglia* awaited More's return from a journey. It had been left for him by an unknown person. The editor has identified him as William Barlow, at this time wavering between orthodoxy and heresy, later a zealous Reformer, and finally, after persecution under Henry VIII

[4] Stapleton, cap. 4 (tr., Hallett).
[5] Allen VII, Ep. 1863, xi, 3-4, and note.
[6] Allen VII, Ep. 1928.
[7] Hutton, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 200.
[8] Allen IV, Ep. 1220.
[9] De Vocht, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

and again under Mary, appointed by Elizabeth to the bishopric of Chichester.[10]

Bugenhagen began his epistle with a paraphrase of St. Paul's form of address, rejoicing that the Gospel was heard gladly in England. More criticized him for arrogating to himself the Apostolic style when it would have been more modest for him to imitate the Apostolic character. He did not consider himself one of the 'saints' to whom the letter had been addressed, since to the 'saints' nothing was holy except the Lutheran sect. Bugenhagen's opening sentence More could answer adequately only in several pages. A summary, given largely in words translated from his own, will perhaps illustrate More's controversial style best.

There are very few in England, he writes Bugenhagen, who gladly hear the 'Gospel of God' as preached by the Cacangelists Luther, Carlstadt, Oecolampadius. It is not the Gospel as it has been preached in England for a thousand years. Most people in England are too strong in the faith to accept such a 'Gospel,' because they hear of the evils resulting from its profession — the destruction in Germany wrought by the Peasants' Revolt, the setting of laity against clergy, the arming of common folk against magistrates, the stirring of people against princes, the causing of battles, ruins, wars and massacre, the breaking of vows of celibacy.

Does it profit the Gospel to destroy the sacraments, to scorn the saints, to blaspheme the Mother of Christ, to despise the Cross, to release from vows of celibacy, to urge monks and nuns to marry?

The whole of Christian tradition, More writes, is opposed to this new sect, the certain words of Scripture, the condemnation of the Fathers, and this in spite of the fact that the Lutheran heretics had thought they alone knew all things, Luther blasphemously writing that he cared not for ten Jeromes, nor a hundred Cyprians, a thousand Augustines, nor ten thousand Chrysostoms.

Orthodox books have been preserved through the centuries, but works of heretics have perished with them. As there was in earlier times no burning of heretical books, this loss was plainly by the hand of God. From the works of the holy Fathers the faithful will take an antidote for the poison of Bugenhagen's writing. There is agreement among the Fathers, but dissension among the heretics.

More adds that Bugenhagen should not think it possible to win the English, since even he should know what an opponent Luther has in the King. Does Bugenhagen think he can win them by arrogating to himself the title of Bishop of Wittenberg, by daring to teach men to break their solemn vows as he had by his own

[10] Identification in marginal note. For Barlow, *cf.* D.N.B. article.

marriage, so that he can discharge the office of Pope among the English?[11]

More's allusions at this point need some comment. The fact that he cites the king as defender of the Church[12] is part of the evidence for dating the letter early in 1526, for the divorce case, and its questioning of the Pope's power to dispense, was suggested as early as September of that year.[13]

More was distressed by the breach of monastic vows, and treated the marriages of the Reformers without respect. Bugenhagen had married in 1522; Lambert, the first French monk to marry, in 1523; Luther in 1525. There had been some pamphleteering on the subject before any of these marriages took place. Carlstadt had written 'Concerning Celibacy' in 1521.[14] In 1519 Luther had published a sermon on 'Matrimony,' but had then said nothing of marriage for the clergy. In the 1522 and 1523 editions of it he had commented on marriage in spite of previous vows, and even earlier had published the tract 'Concerning Monastic Vows.' Lambert wrote against clerical celibacy in 1524, and in the following year Bugenhagen wrote 'Concerning the Marriage of Bishops and Deacons.'

The reference to Luther as despising the Cross seems to come from Luther's sermon 'Of the holy Cross in Churches,' preached and published in Wittenberg in 1522.[15] In it Luther teaches that it is an error to dedicate churches to the cross of wood on which Christ hung, that we should not adorn fragments of the true cross with gold, but give the money to the poor. He would do away with all crosses which have been objects of pilgrimage. More comes back to this in a later passage in his letter, where he says sharply that Christ had not taught Luther that his cross should be cast away lest it should cost gold. This Luther learned from his brother Judas, when he said, to what purpose is this waste?[16] It could have been sold for much and given to the poor. Luther, More states, is deserving of more than one crucifixion for his blasphemies against the cross.[17]

The reference to Bugenhagen as bishop or pope perhaps has its origin in some jest of Luther's, such as his reply to the papal legate, Paul Vergerius, in 1535, acknowledging Lutherian ordinaitons

[11] *Epistle to Bugenhagen*, f. 1-11r.
[12] *Ibid.*, f. 9v (Bv).
[13] A. F. Pollard, *Wolsey*, p. 151.
[14] Herzog-Hauck, art. *Karlstadt*; Hermann Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, 2 vols., 1905.
[15] *Vom hailigen Creutz in den Kirchen; Epistle to Bugenhagen*, f. 10.
[16] *Mark* xiv, 4. [17] *Epistle*, f. 10v.

> 'Certainly we do it, for the Pope will consecrate and ordain none for us. And look, there sits a Bishop, whom we have consecrated and ordained,'

and he pointed to Dr. Pommer, as he often called Bugenhagen.[18] And this jest was made a year before the Elector of Saxony appointed Bugenhagen General Superintendent of the churches.[19] In 1526 he held no position among the Lutherans which could be seriously considered that of an overseer.

As More's letter continues, he treats of the theological questions most at issue between Roman Catholics and Lutherans. The reader feels that More makes good replies, that he does touch weak points, but that Bugenhagen could have refuted some of the statements of this pamphlet if he had replied. He did not, as a matter of fact, answer either Cochlaeus or More.

In reply to the Lutheran emphasis on the scriptural foundations of their doctrinal teaching,[20] More stressed the value of the tradition taught in the Church.

As in all controversy in the age of the Reformation, there is much discussion in this correspondence of justification by faith *alone*, or by faith *and* good works. Each controversialist might fairly claim that the other had imperfectly understood his position. More is very concerned with all antinomian tendencies in Bugenhagen's teaching on justification by faith. When Bugenhagen tries to guard against this very misunderstanding, More considers his system of thought inconsistent.

More defends Catholic doctrine by showing that the Church does not put its confidence in good works. Nothing is more inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church than that anyone should attribute anything to himself, yet in the common name of the whole Church it is permissible for Catholic Christians to glory in the fact that they alone are just, they alone are Christians. For among mortals there is none holy outside the Church, nor is anyone a Christian.[21]

As Bugenhagen had slurred monastic life, as an example of confidence in good works, More defended differences in the mode of life in various religious orders:

> 'I do not think it is a great evil if under one leader Christ some fight under divers others as it were Tribunes, and while all live well and according to Evangelical rule from the Evangelical precept, each spends his time in different ways and each abounds in different kinds of virtues.'[22]

More admitted frankly that many failed in the monastic life, but considered that even so the purest part of the Christian people

[18] Vogt, *op. cit.*, p. 364. [19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Cf.* quotation from Bugenhagen, in *Epistle*, f. 16.

[21] Cyprian, Ep. 73, xxi; *Epistle to Bugenhagen, f.* 21v-22.

[22] *Ibid.*, f. 24v.

was always found among the religious. They bear the Cross above all others, he said, who selling all that they have and giving to the poor, follow Christ, while dedicating their whole life to fasting and prayer and following the Lamb in chastity, they crucify their flesh with its vices and desires. More held up to scorn the softness of the 'Evangelical' life in contrast to monastic life.[23]

The Lutherans must know, More continued, that Catholics believe and teach that good works without faith have no merit, for when they have done all, they are unprofitable servants. Even so, God rewards them, as the master of the vineyard those whom he had set to work at the eleventh hour.[24] If the Lutherans take away the fruit of good works, they make men lukewarm to doing well.[25]

As Bugenhagen, in his very anxiety to avoid antinomianism, has said that he who has faith is a good tree which must in its time bear good fruit, More chides him for inconsistency:

> 'For if there is such a thing as good works which faith necessarily produces: what else are you doing, disputing against good works, than blabbing out against the fruit of faith? "Faith without works is dead, which the demons also believe and shudder."'[26]

And then he adds sarcastically:

> 'It is vain to quote to you the *Epistle of James*, for as you formerly found it inconvenient, it ceased to be apostolic to you.'

Luther had called it 'an epistle of straw.' And, again, perhaps Bugenhagen will not accept the passage from *St. Matthew*, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and in thy name do many mighty works?'[27]

> 'It is not therefore true, Pomeranus, that faith alone suffices, and whoever has faith, necessarily produces the fruit of good works.
>
> 'But why should I adduce Christ to you?[28] Why not rather Luther to a Lutheran? Hear therefore what he says, whose authority with you is incontestable. "Nothing," he says, "can damn a man except incredulity. For all other things, if faith remains or returns, are absorbed by faith."'

By such confidence in faith alone, More considers that Bugenhagen and Luther confirm a licence to sin and a freedom to reject the holiness of a more austere life.

More asks Bugenhagen

> 'whether the man who neglects good works and commits evil does not close heaven and open hell to himself. If you deny this, you leave no one in doubt . . . that you are he, who provokes the whole world to sin, having offered impunity for such deeds. But if you concede the value of good works, which you must, then you can never deny that if the evil of our works plunges us to hell, the goodness of those which we do with the divine aid, helps us from hell and renders us to some degree suitable for

[23] *Ibid.*, f. 24v-25v. [24] *Matt.* xx, 10
[25] *Epistle*, f. 25v-f. 27. [26] *Ibid.*, f. 28v-f., 30; *James* ii, 19.
[27] *Epistle*, f. 30; *Matt.* vii, 22, 23. [28] *Epistle*, f. 30v-f. 31v.

the promised reward of heaven. It would be absurd . . . if God, who is so merciful, did not reward virtue, when he punishes wickedness.' [29]

Since the publication of Erasmus' *Diatribe concerning Free Will* in 1524 and Luther's *Bondage of the Human Will* in 1525, the differences between Catholics and Lutherans on this doctrine had been much discussed. More wrote to Bugenhagen : [30]

> 'Why should you persuade anyone to do good if there is no freedom of the will? You should merely pray God, that He should accomplish all things in me, but not urge me to try anything myself. If all things proceed from faith, if nothing is truly free for men, as you Lutherans hold with the teeth, you have assuredly left no cause, why you should move anyone to virtue, or punish any guilty one. Nor have you anything which you can object to your adversaries, if they do nothing freely, but are in everything forced by fate, unless perchance you reply, that even the things which you yourself write, you write not by your own will, but by an instinct of fate.'

More accused the Lutherans of omitting all passages of Scripture which defend the freedom of the will. Nor did Luther answer the Scriptures which Erasmus quoted in his *Diatribe on the Freedom of the Will.* He has no reply to the passage 'keep my commandments' [31] by which the sacred Eloquence witnesses the freedom of the will. God would not command man to do what He knew man could not do. This would be insane comment. Finally, to take away the freedom of the will, makes God not the avenger so much as the author of all wrongs.[32]

To interpret doctrine so narrowly seems exaggeration of its tendency to fatalism. But evidently More had in mind striking passages from the *Bondage of the Human Will*, in which Luther said that it was 'the highest step in faith to believe that He is clement, who saves so few.' And again, 'Free will can never be predicated of man, but only of God.' And finally, the most picturesque passage of all :

> 'The human will is like a beast of burden. If God mounts it, it wishes and goes as God wills ; if Satan mounts it, it wishes and goes as Satan wills. Nor can it choose its rider, nor betake itself to him it would prefer, but it is the riders who contend for its possession.' [33]

In his discussion of the sacraments, Bugenhagen had again said that the Lutheran creed is summed up in 'Christ is our justice,' and that their beliefs are entirely based on the Scriptures. More replied by pointing out the differences between Catholics and Lutherans with regard to the sacramental system. More considered that his opponents untaught all that Christ did not

[29] *Epistle*, f. 37-37v. [30] *Ibid.*, f. 43-43v.
[31] *Matt.* xix, 17.
[32] *Epistle*, f. 43v-45.
[33] Quoted by Preserved Smith, *Erasmus*, c. xii ; *cf.* also Herzog-Hauck, art. *Luther*, by Köstlin.

expressly teach. All that Christ taught the Church through so many holy Fathers, Evangelists, Martyrs and Apostles is to be untaught, he said, unless Christ taught it expressly during His earthly life.[34]

> 'Who before this had ever "despised the prayers of the Church? Who disparaged decoration in churches? Who scorned the worship of the Saints? Who denied Purgatorial fire? Who did not consider the Thanksgiving of the Mass a sacrifice? Who thought that bread remained with the flesh of Christ?"'[35]

It is clear, however, that More misinterpreted the differences in Eucharistic doctrine among the Reformers, and said that Carlstadt, Zwingli and Oecolampadius had taken away completely the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, leaving mere bread.[36] The truth of it is that Zwingli did believe in the Presence of Christ in the sacrament, and taught that His body is eaten in the Communion 'sacramentally and spiritually.'[37] Luther tolerated few differences, but said 'there is not much danger whether you believe there is or there is not bread in the Sacrament.'[38] More noted the antagonism of Luther to Carlstadt, Zwingli and Oecolampadius and said that Luther will not allow anyone else to be Heresiarch of this sect.[39]

The Epistle ends with a most earnest plea to Bugenhagen to leave the Lutheran sect and return to the Catholic Church, to give up the Episcopate which he sinfully holds, to end his unlawful union, and to do penance for the rest of his life.[40]

> 'If you do these things, Pomeranus (I pray God that you may) then you will at last rejoice about us and we in turn, who grieved that you should be lost, shall be glad that you are found.'[41]

More's biographers make scant comment on his *Epistle to Bugenhagen*. Although Stapleton quotes from it as an example of More's controversial style, it is without citation.[42] The epistle can have reached only a small circle in More's own day. It is curious that it is not even mentioned by Bugenhagen's biographer.

More wrote the epistle when he was already Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and a member of the King's council of twenty members, and one of those appointed to be in 'contynuall attend-

[34] *Epistle*, f. 50.
[35] *Ibid.*, f. 50-50v. [36] *Ibid.*, f. 50v.
[37] Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl, passin*, especially p. 49; G. Mehnert, *Luthers und Zwinglis Streit über das Abendmahls-Dogma*; Barclay, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, pp. 41-106.
[38] *Address to the Christian Nobility*, 24.
[39] *Epistle*, f. 51v. [40] *Ibid.*, f. 55.
[41] *Ibid.*, f. 55v.
[42] The quotations have been identified by Monsignor Hallett in his excellent translation of Stapleton.

ence' at ten and two each day.[43] He could find time for such theological study only by rising at two and studying till seven[44]

His arguments did not avail to the conversion of Bugenhagen and Luther. He himself realized that that was not to be. In that same year he said to his son-in-law,

> 'Troth it is indeed, sonne Roper, I pray God, that some of vs, as highe as we seeme to sitt uppon the mountaynes, treading heretikes vnder our feete like ant*es*, live not the day that we gladly wold wishe to be at a league *and* composition with them, to let them have their churches quietly to themselves, so that they wold be contente to let vs have ours quietly to ourselves.' Roper replied, 'By my troth, sir, it is very desperately spoken. . . .' More, 'by thes wordes perceiuinge me in a fume, said merily vnto me: "Well, well, sonne Roper, It shall not be so, It shall not be so."'[45]

But, if the Lutherans were unconvinced, More's controversial writing won the respect of the leaders of the Church. In March 1528, Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, licensed him to own and read heretical books for the purpose of refuting them.[46] The first fruit of this licence was his 'Dialogue with Tyndale,' in English, which, interestingly enough, repeats much of the argument to Bugenhagen. The Chacellorship from 1529 to 1532 interrupted his writing but not his concern. When he had resigned his office and had only a small income left to him, a gift was collected for him by the clergy in gratitude for his service, but More had written with thought only of loyalty to the Church, and refused the gift.[47]

In time, the spirit of his controversy gradually changed. The letter to John Fryth, 1 December 1532, deals gently with the young heretic, though his 'erronyouse wrytyng . . . agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aultare' touched More's religious sensitiveness far more than the debate over faith and good works. Professor Chambers noted that the *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation*, written during imprisonment in the Tower in 1535, is 'his farewell to controversy,' as he hoped that the Germans, caused by God 'to agree together in the defence of His name' against the Turks, may be brought 'to agree together in the truth of His faith.'[48]

To himself, More was innocent of cruelty or too great severity in his treatment of heretics. Still there is his comment in his

[43] Harpsfield, *Life of More*, ed. Hitchcock, pp. 107, 318-319.
[44] Stapleton, *Tres Thomae*, 1588, p. 43.
[45] Roper, *Life of More*, ed. Hitchcock, pp. 34-35.
[46] Tunstall, *Register*, f. 138; Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, p. 711.
[47] Harpsfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-113.
[48] R. W. Chambers, *The Place of St. Thomas More in English Literature and History*, pp. 52-54; quotation from *English Worker*, p. 1153.

epitaph that he was not 'odious to the nobility nor unpleasant to the people, but yet to thieves, murderers and heretics grievous.'[49] Surely even in writing his epitaph, his sense of humour did not desert him. Any good judge would hope he had been grievous to thieves and murderers, and any good theologian would hope he had been grievous to heretics.

BOOK REVIEWS

SCIENCE AND THE CREATION*

The Riddell Lecturer is required to treat of the relation between religion and contemporary development of thought. The great modern developments of physical and natural knowledge have not been without influence on religion. The outlook of modern man, and especially of modern non-religious man, is dominated by ideas derived from the natural sciences, which may induce a frame of mind unfavourable to religious belief. 'The influence of science on religion is not logical but psychological.'

In the first of these three lectures — 'What is Permanent in Nature' — Professor Whittaker deals with recent theories about the constituent elements of the physical universe. After outlining the development of the aether theories of the nineteenth century physicists, he shows how these were overthrown by researches into the velocity of light, which proved that an aether, if it existed, would have to be 'at rest' relative to all moving bodies, whatever their velocities, which is manifestly absurd.

> 'Thus the universal medium out of which all things were supposed to be made, and which had played such a great part in natural philosophy since the days of Anaximander, was finally proved to be a theoretical impossibility.'

And not only could light now no longer be regarded as a disturbance of an all-pervading aether; the behaviour of X-rays rendered it doubtful whether the wave theory itself was fully adequate, for the X-ray 'does not spread itself like a wave, but remains in a compact bundle like a particle.' This, says Professor Whittaker, is only one amongst many phenomena in which the behaviour of light seems to be corpuscular rather than undulatory. Moreover the electron, like light, appears to have a dual character: it is not, as was at first thought, a particle in the ordinary sense, but has two aspects, particle and wave.

> 'It is now recognized that this duality was something fundamental in physics: that the ultimate constituents of the universe are neither pure particles nor pure waves, but have properties which are associated with both these conceptions.'

Thus the latest view of things differs from the ancient atomism of Democritus and the recent atomism of Dalton in two respects. Firstly, the atoms of the classical physics were indestructible and without beginning, whereas it now seems probable that all the elementary particles of modern physics can be created and destroyed. Secondly, these particles are not small bodies having definite positions and velocities, but have no definite position asso-

[49] Harpsfield, *op. cit.*, p. 280. The translation is Rastell's.

* *The Beginning and End of the World.* Riddell Memorial Lectures. By Edmund Taylor Whittaker, F.R.S., Sc.D., LL.D. (Humfrey Milford. pp. 64. 2/6.)

ciated with a definite velocity; the ideas of form and location in space do not apply to them; they can be represented only by mathematical expressions.

> 'Modern mathematical physics, then, asserts that, in the last analysis, the external world is constituted of entities which have no permanent existence, no shape, and no location, and which cannot be described otherwise than by mathematical formulae. . . . Mechanism has been replaced by a pan-mathematical conception of the universe.
>
> 'The overthrow of the physical concepts of the last generation has very naturally led to a change in the attitude of men of science — or at any rate of mathematical physicists, for the new ideas have not yet permeated much beyond them—towards philosophical interpretations of the universe. The latter half of the nineteenth century was the heyday of scientific materialism. . . . The materialist position however collapsed when matter itself collapsed into a mathematical theory of corporundals: for mathematics is unquestionably a function of the mind.'

The lecture on 'The Energy of the Universe and its Degradation' can hardly be summarized here. The doctrine of the Conservation of Energy is no longer valid in its nineteenth century form, and its place is taken by 'a theorem which is interesting and beautiful but which can be stated only in a rather technical mathematical language: *the divergence of the energy-tensor is null.*' The new formulation 'negatives the possibility of a physical monism,' *i.e.* a doctrine of a single permanent substratum of the world; and when it is combined with the knowledge that the elementary particles can be created and destroyed, it leaves us with a picture of complete mutability in the universe, permanence belonging only to abstract and timeless concepts, namely mathematical laws, as Pythagoras taught two thousand years ago.

According to the law of *Degradation of Energy,* the total amount of energy in the universe does not change, but is always suffering degradation, and can never climb back to its original state. The universe is running down, and eventually will attain its state of maximum entropy, when all bodies will be at the same temperature, and all life have ceased.

> 'Since entropy is essentially positive, its steady increase must have had a beginning—a *creation,* when the total entropy of the universe was less than it has ever been subsequently. It was never possible to oppose seriously the dogma of the Creation except by maintaining that the world has existed from all eternity in more or less its present state: and no one can now hold this language in face of the facts.'

If Professor Whittaker be right in holding that the world has been created in time, and will ultimately die, this is certainly of importance for metaphysics and theology, for it implies that God is not Nature, and Nature is not God.

These lectures deserve very careful study; they will be found reassuring to theologians generally.

J.C.H.

A NEW STUDY OF THE SECOND ISAIAH*

The Schweich Lectures, 1940 (*Isaiah, chapters xl—lv*), make a somewhat tardy appearance, but this is probably due to war conditions. It is one of the most interesting books of Biblical criticism recently published, and it consists of three lectures, each with a valuable bibliography and copious notes, and ends with a chronological arrangement and analysis of the prophecies.

Since Isaiah was sawn asunder by the higher critics more than half a century ago, many problems of interpretation have arisen, particularly in

* *Isaiah, Chapters xl-lv.* Literary Criticism and History. By Sidney Smith, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1940.) Oxford University Press. 10/6.

reference to the second half of the book, chapters xl—lxvi. As a result, the higher critics have since sawn asunder this second portion of the book at the conclusion of chapter lv. Hence the modern reader is now the happy possessor of three Isaiahs—Proto Isaiah, Deutero Isaiah and Trito Isaiah. Dr. Sidney Smith, in his first lecture, 'Recent Criticism of Isaiah, xl—lv,' describes the history of the past thirty years, mainly dealing with the system, *Gattungsforschung,* research into types, and says at its close:

> 'If, then, it be asked what the nature of Isaiah xl—lv as historical evidence is, the durable results of criticism in all the ebb and flow of opinion during the last thirty years may be summed up briefly. Few doubt that the main bulk of these chapters was written some time in the years 547—538 B.C. The tendency has been increasingly to regard interpolations as few and brief, and nothing for which a reasonable historical explanation can be found need be treated as spurious. The chapters were, too, what they appear to be, not a book, but a series of prophetic utterances, and very few critics claim that any are considerably later than the fall of Babylon. Whether all the utterances were necessarily so short, or fell into traditional types, as some critics think, is open to doubt; but that each complete utterance is logically independent and must be judged by itself, without preconception, is one of the great advances due to recent work. There is, for example, no proof of chronological order in the arrangement of the utterances . . .
>
> 'But the knowledge of certain events between 547 and 539 was lost little over a century afterwards, and the clue to some of the allusions has been missing, perhaps, ever since. Historical study has progressed a little towards making good that loss; a consideration of the results of recent discoveries must, then, follow this summary of critical opinions' (pp. 22, 23).

The second lecture, 'History of the Years 556—539 B.C.,' makes full use of recent discoveries, and is, perhaps, the most valuable lecture in the book. The third lecture is on 'Some Unrecognised Historical Material in Isaiah xl—lv,' and Dr. Sidney Smith identifies Cyrus as the 'Servant of Yhwh.' Here is a specimen of how the lecturer treats it:

> 'The actual address to the servant, Cyrus, in xlii, 6, starts with the affirmation that YHWH's call to him is "in right"; what is meant is explained in the next clause. Cyrus will be accepted as the chosen king of Israel, YHWH will grasp his hand, a formula of a kind known in many lands of the ancient East indicating divine acceptance. Cyrus was not to be a foreign conqueror, but a legitimate king, appointed by YHWH. Then come phrases that have been the subject of endless discussions. Critics have altered the words, excised one phrase or the other or both. What can "covenant of the people" and "light of the nations" mean? Some have affirmed that "light of the nations" can only denote "one who brings light to the nations," and therefore interpret "covenant of the people" as "one who negotiated a covenant for the people." Yet that is not what the text says. Cyrus was to be "the light of the nations," and it is the function of light to enable men to see, "to open blind eyes," a phrase so worded that it is impossible to say whether YHWH Himself or Cyrus is to do these things, because it is a matter of indifference, since Cyrus executes what YHWH wills. What the nations are to see are new things, the right, the position of Israel. And the position of Israel will be assured, not by a written, but by a living, covenant, Cyrus in person, who is to bring men sitting in darkness from the house without light, the rule of Babylon, into the

light, his own direct rule. The figures are not so difficult to interpret. Historically, it is important to note that the oracle does not state that Cyrus is already "a covenant of the people," but only that God will mould him (the metaphor of the potter so constantly used in these chapters) to be so; and though the plan for freeing the exiles and restoring Israel is already formed, there is nothing about Jerusalem or the rebuilding of the temple. The date is still the time when an attack on Palestine was in preparation' (p. 59).

The book has a noble close. At the end of the third lecture Dr. Sidney Smith says:

> 'It merely serves to show that the prophet of xl—lv was a man of the same stature as the Isaiah who prophesied in the time of Hezekiah, a religious leader facing the urgent political problems of his time with greater faith and courage, from a broader, less national, point of view than the majority in Israel could understand . . . Owing to the traditions of that order the book of Isaiah contains much that is finest in Old Testament thought; in that book the section consisting of xl—lv holds the central place by reason of its supreme confidence in the discernment of God's will as effective in history, past, present, and to come' (p. 75).

All students should make a study of this fine book.

S. H. N. PILCHER.

BOOKS FOR TEACHERS

Selections from the Old Testament,[1] edited by A. Gilkes and Guy Boas, can be unreservedly recommended. There is much to be said for presenting boys and girls with the Old Testament in a selection, rather than complete, and this is a very comprehensive and well-produced selection, covering the whole range of Biblical prophecy, history, poetry, and wisdom. It includes some passages from the Apocrypha. There is a chronological table, brief, to the point, and unlikely to overburden the pupil with unnecessary names or facts; a map of Palestine, and a few notes. The lay-out of the text makes it easy to read, and is without reference to chapter and verse. This is good in itself, but makes reference to the notes rather difficult. The reader has to count lines, and may have to count a whole page of them, before he finds what he wants. There is a short introduction, which might perhaps have been expanded with advantage. It attempts a lot in too short a space; it is some five hundred words long, and ranges over the relationship between science and religion, the historical purpose of the Old Testament, the spiritual nature of God, and the critical approach to the Bible. Such large subjects treated in this compressed scale might mean something to a thoughtful sixth-former. The text of the selections would be useful, for study purposes, to any boy or girl aged 14 or upward, and to anyone teaching the subject who was prepared to give it a limited amount of thought and study.

The Teaching of the Bible,[2] by Bede Frost, is something of a mixture, containing some that is good and some that is less than good. In his introduction the author says, 'What I have tried to do in as short a space as possible, and, consequently, in a restricted and incomplete way, is to state clearly what the Bible is, and why it is regarded as the text-book to be used in the religious instruction to be given in the schools of this country.' He also says, 'The title of this book is to be understood as covering both the

[1] *Selections from the Old Testament.* Edited for the Modern Reader by A. Gilkes, M.A., and Guy Boas, M.A. (Macmillan & Co. 4/6.)

[2] *The Teaching of the Bible.* By Bede Frost. (A. R. Mowbray & Co. 1945. 5/-.)

teaching contained in the Bible, and the act and manner by which that teaching is conveyed to adolescents and others.' In carrying out this entirely laudable task Fr. Bede Frost recommends (p. 39) starting with Acts ii, being the first public presentation of the Gospel to the world; a passage which is full of significant facts, and calls for repentance, change of mind, regarding the Person and the work of Jesus, and one's attitude to Him.

He points out how easy it is to have a half-knowledge of Biblical criticism, and that in such a matter 'a little learning is a dangerous thing.' Whether he would be prepared to continue the quotation:

> 'Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;
> There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> And drinking largely sobers us again,'

is perhaps more doubtful. He pleads that the teacher should depend more on the Bible and less on criticism of it, using the rather doubtful analogy of Shakespeare's plays. He has some wise words on the nineteenth-century orthodox Protestant's idea of the literal verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, pointing out that this has never been the doctrine of traditional Christianity.

Unfortunately in chapter 7, the longest in the book, the author throws most of his good principles to the winds, and presents the reader with a hotch-potch of references and texts, thrown together higgledy-piggledy regardless of dates and authorship. He professes thus to give the Bible's teaching on such subjects as the Existence and Nature of God; the Existence and Office of Angels; Man in relation to God; Sin, its origins, causes, and consequences; Jesus Christ. The plain fact, that the Bible often teaches differently on these subjects at different chronological *strata* of its composition, is ignored; Chronicles has to rub shoulders with First Isaiah, II Maccabees with Revelation, I Timothy with Romans, Acts with II Peter, in one all-embracing agglomeration of assorted reference. This is a chapter which anyone could make with the help of a Concordance, and most teachers who had access to one would make it better than this.

On p. 106 the reference to II Peter iii really begins half-way through v. 3; and on p. 52 there is a reference to Delius' incidental music to 'The Tempest.' Delius certainly never wrote any, so perhaps that of Sibelius is intended. The names are not unlike, but their music differs considerably.

The book sins in two matters against the canons of book-production, in that there is no index, and no title on the spine.

W. H. Oldaker.

CIVILIZATION, SCIENCE AND RELIGION*

The cultured reader will have learnt to be wary of small books with too ambitious or comprehensive titles. They are usually intended for those who desire a short cut to knowledge. It would, however, be entirely wrong to suppose that one of the latest additions to the 'Pelican' series, *Civilization, Science and Religion,* falls within this category. Its author, the Professor of Philosophy at Manchester University, is to be congratulated upon this sketch of civilization from the dim beginnings of history to the present day. His thesis is that 'civilization is fundamentally spiritual, not material' (p. 9). Consequently the history of civilization has largely depended upon what men have been thinking about spiritual things. In the main part of the book Prof. Ritchie confines himself to European civilization. This

> 'rests upon three legs. They are Greek science, Jewish religion and Roman law' (p. 38).

* *Civilization, Science and Religion,* by A. D. Ritchie (Pelican Books. pp. 188. 9*d.* 1945).

The chief features of Judaism are summed up under four heads. First, God is a God of righteousness. Secondly, He was conceived as a person and, thirdly, as active in human history. Fourthly, Hebrew religion is a religion of law.

Then follows an excellent account of Greek metaphysics, prefaced by a brief sketch of Greek history. Their scientific achievements are considered first:—

> 'The Greeks did succeed in laying foundations in all branches of science, except chemistry, so that the pioneers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could build directly on them; there was nothing to change or undo. The foundations were secure because the Greek began with a demand for explanation or understanding—a demand not given in experience nor arising out of utility' (p. 46).

But, of course, Greek thinking extended far beyond the limits of natural science.

> 'The tendency of the early thinkers was to take all knowledge for their province, and out of this tendency came the attempt to make a complete synthesis which we now call philosophy' (pp. 47-8).

Hence they arrived at the distinction between appearance and reality which is the starting-point for science as well. To those who, like the so-called Logical Positivists, hold that metaphysics is impossible and non-sensical, Prof. Ritchie makes this reply:

> 'If metaphysics is, as some think, a new (but dull) kind of mythology or "silly nonsense," then you can abolish metaphysics only by abolishing the distinction [between appearance and reality] and taking the very difficult line of argument that everything which appears is equally real and everything real actually appears' (pp. 48-9).

It was Socrates and Plato who moved the centre of metaphysical speculation from the natural world to man and God.

> 'Together these two produced one of the great revolutions in human thought . . . The modern European, even if he explicitly rejects Plato, still uses Platonic modes of thought and Platonic terminology. If he has any articulate religious views, they will be Platonic so far as they are articulate. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that so far as the modern European sees God he sees through Plato with one eye and the Hebrew prophets with the other. I beg pardon for such a grotesque metaphor, but it is appropriate because the Platonic and Hebraic aspects of our thought have existed side by side and have not been really synthesized' (p. 52).

Our debt to Greece is summed up thus:—

> 'The main gift of the Greeks to the development of religion was theology—that is, religious metaphysics, or the attempt to apply scientific method to the totality of things, and to the ultimate elements of thought, including religious experience' (p. 58).

One of the main differences between the Hebrew and the Hellenic conceptions of God is that, whereas the former really thought of Him as personal, to the latter, even at the highest level, God is rather the principal of order in the universe personified. Prof. Ritchie defends the Hebrew conception against the charge of anthropomorphism:—

> 'To those who object that it is anthropomorphic to conceive God as a person, the reply is that, since we are men, we cannot escape the necessity of conceiving everything in terms of our own experience' (p. 56).

In this respect Dr. Julian Huxley comes in for some severe criticism:—

> 'Dr. Julian Huxley[1] argues: "Theistic belief depends on man's projection of his own ideas and feelings into nature; it is a personification of non-personal phenomena. Personification is God's major premise. But it is a mere assumption." Using the same method, we can say: "Scientific belief depends upon man's projection of his own ideas and feelings into nature: it is a humanization of non-human phenomena. Humanization is science's major premise. But it is a mere assumption." Dr. Huxley assumes (after Descartes) that "mind" and "nature" are separate, possessing nothing in common; that scientific truth consists in mind miraculously receiving something from "nature"; that mind can project its own ideas into nature but is guilty of fallacy in so doing, though Dr. Huxley himself does it when he speaks to a friend or writes a book' (pp. 56-7).

From the thought of Greece and Palestine we pass on to the rise of Christianity in the Roman Empire. First of all it is explained how, in the Empire of Augustus, the stage was set, as it were, for a world religion to begin. Then that religion is itself treated in some detail. According to Prof. Ritchie, the main characteristics of the Gospel are twofold:—

> 'The first part of the Christian good news is simply this: that though of our own initiative we always fail, and generally fail badly, we need not depend upon our own initiative, for God is ready to help . . . The second part of the Christian message was that (God) had come unsought and actually was near always. God in Jesus of Nazareth had become man' (p. 63).

Of the resurrection he wisely remarks:—

> 'The problem of the empty tomb, I am inclined to think, is not very relevant. The risen Christ revealed Himself only to His own faithful disciples, not to the High Priest of the Jews, the Roman Governor, or the mob who had shouted "Crucify Him." How could He? Whatever outward experience they might have had, they could not have known or understood. How could they? None of them would have been convinced by the empty tomb . . . The conclusion, I fear, is that we are ignorant *how* Jesus rose from the dead, but we have good evidence *that* He did' (pp. 65, 76).

The problem of miracles in general is also carefully considered, and an attractive interpretation of the Feeding of the Five Thousand is given on pp. 73-4.

At a time when an exaggerated emphasis upon dogma seems to have become part of the stock-in-trade of the lay theologian, it is refreshing to find that Prof. Ritchie adopts a thoroughly common sense attitude towards the subject:—

> 'Dogmas are like buoys that mark shoal water. They are the result of the accumulated experience of the pilots of the past ages. Of course some buoys may be badly placed; vessels of shallow draft can sometimes disregard them; by taking soundings the pilot can do without them—in a fog he may have to. True religion is just successful pilotage, however achieved; but on the whole it is sensible to pay attention to the buoys' (p. 81).

On the other hand, the following has a familiar ring about it and one wonders whether it is a case where even Homer nods:—

[1] Essay in *The Uniqueness of Man*, p. 282.

'If we reject (St. Paul's) doctrine, we reject everything. It is hardly likely that scholars can get behind him to an "historical Jesus" stripped of Pauline accretions, if only because the other New Testament writings (except perhaps the *Epistle of St. James*) are so very Pauline' (p. 66).

Is it not partly because the Third Gospel shows such slight traces of Pauline influence that its Lucan authorship has been questioned?

The following chapter embraces the long period between the rise of Christianity and the rise of science in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was, of course, during this time that the Roman Church rose to the height of its power. Prof. Ritchie regards the organization of Christianity into an ordered society as at best a rather unfortunate necessity, a purely human expedient:—

'Rules and officials . . . are the thin end of the Devil's wedge. Thus the Christian Church (or Churches) has not escaped the chequered fate of human institutions . . . On the whole, the Gospel narratives convey the impression that Jesus avoided initiating any definite organization, or laying down any rules, or limiting the freedom of action of His disciples. Rather, His concern was to instruct and inspire and then commission them to continue His work' (pp. 83, 84, 87).

He therefore concludes:—

'That in so far as the Christian Church has been a political organization, its successes, though great, have been partial, imperfect and human rather than divine; and therefore its political structure is no more than a human makeshift of limited utility and no necessary part of its Master's plan" (p. 87).

It is not often that the thought of the Middle Ages is estimated impartially. The usual tendencies are either to be frankly contemptuous or else to view the whole period through rose-coloured spectacles. Prof. Ritchie's appreciation is judicious but not unsympathetic. The first and best element in mediaeval thought 'was the idea that the whole universe is a system created and ordered by God' (p. 91). Consequently it is entirely wrong to 'jeer' at the old cosmology for being anthropocentric:—

'That is just what it was not, but what many modern conceptions are. For example, Mr. Russell, in *The Free Man's Worship,* calls upon an indifferent universe to congratulate him on being a brave boy and saying 'boo' to it. It sounds like a joke out of Aristophanes' *Clouds,* where he is caricaturing the physical cosmologies of speculative Greek scientists' (p. 95).

Of modern Humanism, the Professor observes:—

'I suspect that Humanity is only the old tribal god in modern dress, and swollen to such dimensions that he is not easily recognised' (p. 98).

He does not agree that mediaeval thought was timid or conservative until it was in decay. 'The incorporation of Aristotle's philosophy,' he says, 'into Christian tradition, hitherto Neoplatonic, was as daring an innovation as has ever been made' (p. 100).

'Of course, mediaeval theologians had their weaknesses. They claimed too much on slender grounds; but if they are to be damned for that, few men of science have much chance of salvation' (p. 96).

With the development of the natural sciences from the close of the Middle Ages onwards, the popular interest of mankind has been increasingly centred upon them. But it is not with science in itself that popular interest is concerned so much as with the *applications* of science. This distinction is not

generally realized, and hence there is a good deal of confusion of thought. This result, Prof. Ritchie argues, is as bad for science as it is for civilization as a whole.

> 'The man of science and his work are respected at present mostly for the wrong reasons and in the wrong way. If this goes on it will be bad for science. Science may be destroyed in other ways as surely, though not so quickly, as the Nazis have destroyed it in their own country. A frivolous social atmosphere, a purely commercial scale of values, or mere lack of intelligence, may do it; as may a corrupt and oppressive government. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that low general moral standards of any kind might destroy the scientific tradition' (p. 170).

Consequently the respect for truth and the respect for persons which have come to us through Christianity are as necessary to science as the scientific spirit is necessary to religion if it is to be kept free from superstition. Prof. Ritchie quotes the description of the proper Christian outlook given by the seventeenth century Independent minister, Henry Robinson:—

> 'The true temper and proper employment of a Christian is always to be working like the sea, and purging ignorances out of his understanding and exchanging notions and apprehensions imperfect for more perfect, and forgetting things behind to press forward' (p. 130).

'These notions . . . are now scientific orthodoxy,' he observes. 'They may become religious orthodoxy before long. They may cease to be scientific orthodoxy if science comes under political control' (p. 130).

As science is popularly confused with the applications of science, so too it is popularly supposed that all sciences are merely subdivisions of natural science and that the same concepts are valid for them all. Prof. Ritchie is at pains to emphasise the fallacy of this idea. He shows how the concepts of physics are not applicable in the sphere of biology. The social sciences are different again, the science of law for example. But besides these there is such a thing as *moral* science; it is as real as any other science, but 'the moral distinctions between good and evil (cannot) be extracted from science' (p. 103) [*i.e.* from natural science]. It is real because there is such a thing as moral law inherent in the nature of things.

> 'A genuine science of law requires the traditional notion of a "natural law," the doctrine that there are moral standards and principles which are in some sense universal, objective, inherently reasonable, which should obtain universal consent. Without this there is no distinction between law and tyranny. With it there is a standard in terms of which to criticize existing customs, codes and rules' (p. 159).

The fact that people disagree upon questions of morals is no proof that they are merely 'subjective.' On the contrary—

> 'people disagree about morals just because there is something to disagree about, which is in some way absolute, objective, universal' (p. 153).

Rightly or wrongly (in my own opinion wrongly) the Professor does not think that this absolute element in morality necessarily implies theism. 'The logical relation between morality and theism,' he says, 'is mutual reinforcement of principles which can be maintained separately' (p. 184).

It is only the Christian tradition, he concludes, which can supply a 'standard of values and a criterion to distinguish progress in civilization from regress.'

> 'If that fails us, "we are of all men most miserable." Each must act according to the light he sees by, neither following others blindly nor

yet despising them for seeing differently. We must be humble enough to learn from others and eager to go on learning, yet courageous enough to teach and act in spite of opposition; for that is the scientific spirit.'

The relation between science and religion is a well worn theme, but Prof. Ritchie's 'Pelican' will reach many people who would not dream of reading a set of Gifford Lectures, or even books like Streeter's *Reality*, or Dr. Raven's *Science, Religion and the Future*. Moreover, by discussing the intimate way in which both are related to civilization, he is treating the subject from a new angle which is particularly relevant to a time when there is so much talk of 'reconstruction' and of planning a new world. Besides this, the purely historical part of the book is valuable in itself and a good many of the lessons to be drawn from it are carefully pointed.

Doubtless this book will have a wide circulation, and it can safely be entrusted to the man in the street. But others as well, especially clergymen and school teachers, should find it both useful and stimulating.

D. L. Scott.

JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY AND HELLENISM

It has long been a commonplace of the theological lecture room that St. Paul owed some part of his equipment as Apostle to the Gentiles to the influences which surrounded him during his upbringing in the Gentile city of Tarsus. In the course of his Schweich Lectures* Dr. Wilfred J. Knox controverts this assumption, which he regards as baseless and gratuitous. Judaism, he thinks, could have provided St. Paul, and no doubt did provide him, with all he needed in the way of Greek culture and Greek style. St. Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a Pharisee educated at the feet of Gamaliel, who no doubt was quite capable of giving him such hellenistic tincture as he acquired. The Talmud states that Gamaliel II had five hundred lads in his house learning the wisdom of the Jews, and another five hundred learning the wisdom of the Greeks. Whatever we may think about the alleged number of students, here we have evidence that the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem gave apt youths a training which would serve to equip them for a presentation of Judaism likely to be acceptable to hellenistic audiences. The training need not be and probably was not profound; but it was just the kind of training which would give St. Paul all he needed for his missionary work. A smattering of popular philosophy and a second-hand knowledge of Greek literature would suffice. After discussing some of the evidence for Greek influence on St. Paul, Dr. Knox proceeds:

> 'Now all this is the kind of thing which any intelligent young Jew would receive as the proper method for preaching to educated Jews of the Dispersion or the Gentile hearers who were to be found in almost every synagogue; we have direct evidence in the Talmud that such teaching was given at Jerusalem by R. Gamaliel II; it would have been no less needed in the days of R. Gamaliel I, and there is no need to weave elaborate theories as to St. Paul's education in the Greek schools of Tarsus or as to the possibility of his having become acquainted in that city with the mysteries of Mithras. He has a superficial knowledge of popular philosophy; he can write good rhetorical Greek of the Asiatic type when he remembers to do so, but he is quite incapable of sustaining it when he is carried away by his own enthusiasm. He has a smattering of Greek literature drawn from anthologies for the guidance of the preacher or controversialist, and his citizenship of Tarsus is merely a matter of social distinction to be used if occasion should demand it.'

* *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford. (Oxford University Press. 1944. 7/6 net.)

Dr. Knox strongly insists that there was no complete geographical cleavage between hellenistic and conservative Judaism. To suggest that hellenistic Judaism belonged exclusively to the Dispersion and conservative Judaism to Palestine gives a false and misleading picture. Though Josephus paid a short visit to Rome he was Palestinian by origin and education. Yet he possessed Greek culture, and it is hard to imagine that he acquired it all after the fall of Jerusalem. He acquired it in Palestine. On the other hand, Juvenal describes a barbarous type of Judaism which flourished in Rome itself and yet lacked any trace of Greek culture.

Dr. Knox thinks that if Christianity had remained a Palestinian religion it could have got along without any developed theology. 'Judaism was not a theological religion, and Jewish Christians could be content to worship Jesus as Lord without asking how such worship could be reconciled with the monotheism of Israel.' But when once Christianity had embarked on its career as a world religion it became inevitable that it should seek to express itself in a form congenial to popular hellenistic thought and comprehensible by the hellenistic public.

In doing so it adopted the technique of Jewish proselytism. That is where the importance of Philo for the New Testament student comes in. Dr. Knox considers that as a philosopher he was negligible, but that 'as a writer he achieved a dullness which is portentous.' But he was a compiler, albeit a careless and uncritical one, and what he compiled came from a variety of sources, otherwise lost to us, which give us a picture of how Judaism in general sought to present itself to the Gentile world. Inevitably Christianity adopted the same methods. This is most evident in the presentation of Jesus by the writer of the Fourth Gospel. Both Philo and the New Testament writers 'go back to a common tradition of hellenistic Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament to the Greek world.' But, when he comes to the Fourth Gospel, Dr. Knox insists that 'nothing could be more fantastic than to suppose that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had read Philo's works and deliberately substituted the figure of Jesus for the Philonian tradition.' The freshness and spontaneity of the Fourth Gospel were not derived from Philo's laborious pedantry. Philo was concerned to demonstrate that the imagery of the Old Testament was a symbolic cloak for truths of revelation at which the great Greek thinkers only guessed.

> 'The Fourth Gospel uses the same imagery to prove that Jesus is the Logos of Greek philosophy manifested on the stage of history. But the author derived both his imagery and his not very extensive philosophy not from the pages of Philo but from the general tradition of the schools in which the Jew was trained to commend his faith to the Gentile; it is at least possible that when he learnt that tradition it had been translated from Greek into Aramaic. In any case, he is like St. Paul the product of the mixed Greek-Jewish culture of the first century A.D. But this culture was to be found everywhere in the Jewish world and was taken over by the growing Christian culture of which St. Paul is the first literary representative.'

Hoskyns and Davey in their book *The Fourth Gospel* disparage this kind of view of the Johannine Logos on the ground that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is presented not only as the Logos, but also as the Truth, the Light, the Life, the Way, the Resurrection and the Door. To which Dr. Knox retorts that in fact the Philonic Logos itself was also the Truth, the Light, the Life, and the Bread from heaven, not to mention the Living Water, the Vine, and the Shepherd. He adds that if we possessed more of the Jewish-hellenistic literature to which Philo was indebted for his material, it is quite possible that we might find that the Jewish-hellenistic Logos was also the Way and the Door.

Though the Synoptic Gospels reach us through the churches of the Greek world, and even *Mark*, the least hellenistic of them, shows traces of its origin, their sources are redolent of the soil of Palestine. The synoptic tradition, says Dr. Knox, 'gives us a story which could only have happened in this remote backwater.'

He cites as an illustration of hellenistic influence on Marcan style the words attributed to Jesus in Gethsemane. After the words 'Simon, sleepest thou?' Jesus 'breaks into a perfect piece of artificial prose of the popular rhetorical type described in Norden's great work *Die antike Kunstprosa.*' He also attaches significance to the contrast between flesh and spirit as sources of good and evil in the same passage. He considers it to be quite Pauline.

Dr. Knox's discussion of St. Luke's style and use of sources is stimlating and suggestive. He gives St. Luke top marks for general fidelity to his semitic sources, though he adduces examples of the sometimes startling emergence of words dictated by a stylistic conscience. For the most part St. Stephen's speech in *Acts* is 'an atrocity of semitic speech,' but when St. Luke substitutes Babylon for Damascus in the quotation from *Amos*, Dr. Knox is disposed to ascribe the change to St. Luke's literary artistry. 'I suspect,' he says, 'that Luke merely wanted to substitute rhythm for a metrical jingle, and had no deep theological motive.' Style counted with the hellenistic public in those days. Dr. Knox bids his readers bear in mind that an elementary knowledge of rhetoric was almost universal in the partially educated Graeco-Roman world to which the writings of the New Testament were addressed. That may explain why St. Luke inserted into the narrative of the Ethiopian eunuch, written in definitely semitic style, 'a little gem of Greek conversation.'

Dr. Knox defends St. Luke against the accusation of over-addiction to the miraculous. One of the most sensational of his miracles is that of the raising of the widow's son at Nain. But it is told in 'a typical bit of bad translation-Greek, even worse than the average,' and obviously comes from a Palestinian source. If you don't like miracle, here, at any rate, you must not blame St. Luke, but his source. The only point at which Dr. Knox is prepared to admit that St. Luke may be accused of adding a miraculous element to his material as he found it is in the incident of the healing of the ear of the High Priest's servant. And miracle was by no means congenial to the hellenistic mind.

> 'In any case we need not regard credulity as a hellenistic characteristic; in so far as the hellenistic age witnessed a growth of credulity it was due not to the influence of Greece on the East, but to the influence on Greece of oriental religions, among which Judaism was pre-eminent in its fondness for edifying miracles.'

Even in *Mark* Dr. Knox perceives indications of the growth of pious legend. In *Matthew* the tendency to transform legend into history is more definite. In the Fourth Gospel, though the already established Christian tradition constrained the author to adopt the Gospel form, 'factual truth is entirely subordinated to doctrinal tradition.'

In this respect the Fourth Gospel is, according to Dr. Knox, in line with Jewish-hellenistic usage.

> 'It is not to be supposed that the author was conscious that he was changing the Gospel any more than the midrastic exponents of the Old Testament were conscious of changing the sacred story. Since the Torah was God's revelation of Himself to Israel, anything that glorified the Torah or Israel must also glorify God, whether it happened to be true or not. In the same way the evangelist assumes that it is legitimate to rewrite the Gospel in order to bring out its theological meaning.'

If this be so, the parochial clergyman is confronted by a grave problem of casuistry, which, of course, lies quite outside the scope of Dr. Knox's book. His congregation knows nothing of midrastic convention, and if it did would not be interested. It belongs to an alien world. Is a clergyman justified when preaching to an average congregation in treating Christian midrash as if it were historical fact? When we turn to devotional books and books of popular theology it is morally shocking to find many writers, who certainly might be supposed to know something of what Dr. Knox expounds, quoting from the Fourth Gospel in exactly the same way as they would quote from a reliable historical text-book. Are they morally obtuse, or do they suffer from inexcusable ignorance?

In the concluding section of his book Dr. Knox traces the development, in a series of illustrative incidents, of the theme of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The discourse-dialogues, besides expounding the doctrine of Jesus as the Logos, express in the form of controversy between Jesus and the Jews 'the wranglings of Church and synagogue in the hellenistic world.' But, though the terminology of the Fourth Gospel may be that of hellenistic theology, the agent of revelation is the historic Jesus, and, what is of primary importance, '*Gnosis* is replaced by love.' Dr. Knox sums up his discussion of the Fourth Gospel thus:

> 'The greatness of the Gospel lies in the fact that while it interprets the life of Jesus in terms of the theology of the age, it never loses sight of the concrete historical figure of the synoptic tradition or of love as the distinctive quality of Christianity. There are moments when it comes dangerously near to presenting Jesus as a purely docetic epiphany on the stage of history; but these are always corrected by the evangelist's fidelity to the main Christian tradition. A comparison with the apocryphal Gospels of the second Christian century reveals the dangers that beset him and the masterly skill with which he avoided them.'

Dr. Knox has written an important book which demands attention from every serious student of the New Testament. It embodies wide learning and fresh original thought. Its lucidity of style makes it eminently readable.

G. L. H. Harvey.

YOUTH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMMES

The 'Carrot-for-the-Donkey' programme of many Youth Fellowship Meetings was vigorously condemned in a recent correspondence.[1] The Youth Advisory Council in its second report to the Minister of Education[2] has recommended wide and free discussion of the social, religious, political and economic questions which the nation's youths and maidens will in due course be pressed to answer. Yet, owing to the lack of good programmes for Youth gatherings, the villages of England have been stigmatized as 'the graveyards of departed youth organizations.'[3] So it is essential that whatever attempts—whether a local committee, a recognized youth leader or a parson—to engage youth's leisure hours should have a reservoir of ideas and practical items for the programmes of Fellowship and other meetings.

In response to this important and urgent need, *Youth Fellowship Programmes*,[4] by Gordon Fallows and Stella Ford, is a fountain of inspiration. The object of this most timely volume, which is concerned with programmes only, is worded thus:

[1] The correspondence arose from an article entitled 'Youth and the Churches.' See the *Spectator*, Nov. 16—Jan. 11.

[2] *The Purpose and Content of the Youth Service*. Stationery Office. 1945. 4*d*.

[3] *Youth in the Country*, p. 17. Church of England Youth Council, 69 St. Peter Street, S.W.1. 1945. 6*d*.

'There are many excellent handbooks on different activities, such as drama, music, debating and games; but our purpose is briefly to cover the whole range. We have tried to describe programmes in just sufficient detail as to enable them to be used and adapted by other groups. The book has been written primarily for leaders and members of Youth Fellowship Committees to help them to solve the ever-recurring problem: "What shall we put in the programme?" But we hope it will also prove useful to leaders of Youth Groups of many other kinds.'

The authors' motives in programme-making are the five aims advocated by the Church of England Youth Council—Worship, Thought, Service, Witness, Recreation. To gain these ends, the following principles are commended:

'1. Do it yourself (rather than invite a visitor).
2. Find what each can do.
3. Comprehensiveness.
4. Plan and Plan and Plan.'

The skill in applying these principles lies in striking the balance between serious, thoughtful activities and amusing recreation. One method (outside the scope of this book) which the reviewer has found successful in a large city parish is to organize the Fellowship under four sections — say 'Devotional,' 'Dramatic,' 'Debating and Discussion,' 'Dancing' — each section being responsible in weekly rotation for producing one programme a month in which the whole Fellowship participates as opportunity permits. Mr. Fallows and Miss Lord have, in separate chapters, considered programmes for all these activities. There is also a wide selection of 'Indoor Games and Competitions.' There is a chapter on 'Service and Jobs to do' and two more on 'Summer Programmes' and 'Camp,' obviously based on mature experience and the golden motto:

'Take everything that is necessary and nothing else.'

Although *Youth Fellowship Programmes* is written primarily for a Church Youth Fellowship, it is in no way 'ecclesiastical.'

'A Youth Fellowship with an open membership, and yet closely linked with the Church, seems to us the better way. Experience shows that such a Fellowship produces many Confirmation candidates who would never have been drawn within the fellowship of the Church had it not been for their membership in the Youth Fellowship.' . . .

'The first and most important thing is to encourage the members to join Sunday by Sunday in the regular worship of the Church, and no stunts or special services should be allowed to interfere with this.'

Rather the authors' thoughtful conclusion should be borne in mind.

'Finally, we may ask, what binds all these varied programmes together? They include games, music, plays, discussions, jobs of service and many other activities — in fact, almost every activity which men and women pursue. Is there any unifying principle? We believe there is, and it is this which gives to a Youth Fellowship its distinctive character.

Life is one. Every good human activity is, for a Christian, sacred. The many and varied programmes we have enumerated are all carried out within a Christian fellowship — that is to say, within a group where Christian standards are assumed, however imperfectly they may be realized. It is this which makes them one, and which sets the tone of the group.

[4] *Youth Fellowship Programmes*, by Gordon Fallows and Stella Lord. 87 pp., including 'Bibliography' and 'Some Useful Addresses.' (National Society and S.P.C.K. 1945. 2/6.)

A Youth Fellowship should give ample opportunity for young people to express themselves, and to experience the true meaning of Christian fellowship within the larger family of the Church. In a word, the whole object of a Youth Fellowship is to learn the Christian way of life.'

Yes, this book should be possessed by all who have realized that each meeting of a successful Youth organization requires a well-planned and stimulating programme. W.T.A.P.

THE ATONING CHURCH

The sub-title of Dr. Phythian-Adams' latest book, *The Way of At-One-Ment,** is 'Studies in Biblical Theology'; and this gives a clearer indication of its contents than the title proper, for he is concerned not with traditional doctrines of the Atonement as usually understood, but with Reconciliation and Redemption in the widest sense as *the* function of the Christian Church.

The author bases his thesis on two claims: the unity of the Bible as a theological whole, in which every part from the earliest to the latest throws light on every other part; and that within this unity there can be discerned a Pattern of Sacred History, beginning with Moses and the Exodus (*i.e.* the birth of Israel as a nation) and reaching its fulfilment in Jesus Christ and the re-birth of the New Israel, the Christian Church. Indeed, he claims that the correspondence between the Old Testament and the New, the Old Israel and the New, is not accidental nor is it merely analogical, but 'homological,' a term which Dr. Phythian-Adams uses to denote a real, vital, 'economic' relationship.

Having come thus far, the reader who knows not his author may anticipate a tedious and detailed examination of the sacrifices and priesthood of the Old Testament with the object of demonstrating a narrow, hieratical, sacramentalist system of salvation within the Church. But if he goes further he will be agreeably surprised. For though Dr. Phythian-Adams has much to say about the Altar, the Priesthood and the Sacrifices under the Old Dispensation which cannot be summarised here, the 'pattern' which he discerns is that of a whole nation, redeemed from bondage, consecrated a holy people and a royal priesthood, in order that through them all nations shall be brought to the worship of the One God. This reshaping of the 'pattern' by the prophets is, of course, familiar to most of us, though whether it was a genetic development of the 'Mosaic' order is another question. But it is his argument that there is the closest 'homological' connection between this and the primitive Christian community, which believed that it was the true Israel, the New Temple compacted of living stones where God's Presence 'tabernacles' as the spirit of Christ binding all the members into unity, and not least a Holy Priesthood offering the reasonable sacrifice of active self-giving love, which is the Law of the New Covenant. This too is not unfamiliar. It is the further steps which make this a courageous and important book.

In the first place Dr. Phythian-Adams insists that the Church departed at a comparatively early date from the 'pattern' of Biblical theology which at first it had put into practice. The result was and is that Christendom to this day, whether Catholic or Protestant, has forgotten that it was sent to be *Israel*. Moreover, its scheme of redemption is concerned with the salvation of the individual, whereas that salvation should be taken for granted, and the purpose of redemption found in the service offered by the whole People of God.

'From being primarily an event which happened to Israel (the setting of it free that it might be a Royal Priesthood) Redemption came more and more to be thought of as a benefit conferred on individuals, who thereafter must guard themselves from forfeiting it by relapse into sin. It is true

* *The Way of At-One-Ment*, by W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 1944. 7/6.)

that the doctrine of the Church entered in at this point to preserve the Church from outright atomism: but nothing can show better the general trend of thought than the famous aphorism: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* In the last analysis that is an appeal to the individual's concern for his soul: it is the gospel of *Sauve qui veut* . . . Obviously this is an appeal to fear, not to love; it calls for passive acceptance of God's unmerited grace, not for a virile resolve to co-operate selflessly with his purpose . . . Conscious of no task to be performed for God on behalf of the world, the Church's thoughts inevitably turned inwards. Fear and self-interest, however rationalized, became dominant in the centuries which followed: for, whether we like it or not, it is fear and self-interest which have always inspired the dreadful recruiting sentence: "Let them be anathema." Behind this cry lies the assumption that the Church exists for the sake of its members . . . or to put it in other words . . . as a fold designed to protect the sheep inside it. Its wall is the "Catholic Faith," and if this is once tampered with, those within will perish everlastingly' (pp. 49-51).

And here is the other side:

'In a word, *two* things, not one, are seen to be necessary for us men and our salvation. We must be remade, reborn, redeemed, justified (call it what you will), by repentance and faith *as individuals,* because it is in the individual self-hood that the root of the evil lies. But we must find salvation together *as members of a community*; and the living principle of that community, its spirit, the law of its being, must be love' (p. 57).

'The Church's offering — the sacrifice, which is truly most pleasing to God and at the same time most truly its own — is the witness of mutual self-giving love, manifested in ever-growing, ever-deepening holy community' (p. 60).

Read that against the background of our divisions. But there is another aspect of it:

'This truth was familiar enough in the early Church where "the daily ministration" was the chief practical concern of the growing community: with some of us it has faded to a shadow, dimly suggested by the word "alms" and occasional references to the "sick and poor." Yet this is the perfection of At-one-ment, without which fellowship is an empty name; and the offering of a community which is merely "religious" will meet with no acceptance on the Altar of the Cross' (p. 61).

It was in this way and in accordance with the Biblical 'pattern' that the early Church developed its non-sacerdotal ministry of pastoral oversight through the bishops and charitable administration through the deacons, an 'expression of practical love of the brethren without which faith was dead and the love of God a mockery.' So too its 'sacrifice'

'is that which is offered upon the "Altar": and in the living Temple which is the Body of Christ, the Altar must be a living Altar. The Christian's sacrifice, then, is his own free-will offering, whether it be of alms or of a love patient, tender-hearted and forgiving: and the Altar on which he lays it is his neighbour, whether his need be of the body or the soul. But the Christian's offering is never presented alone . . . What the Church *offers* then is the sum-total of sacrifices which have been made by all its members — real "costing" acts of love "in deed and truth" — and what the Church *receives* then is a new communication of the Divine At-one-ness, knitting it closer in the Flesh and Blood of Jesus, in "faith" and "love"' (p. 83).

And the validity of the sacrifice which (in the early Church) required the presence of the Bishop 'does not lie in the possession by the Bishop of some peculiar mystical power over the Elements: it arises simply from his being the man whom his Church has itself chosen to be the focus of its holy community' (*ibid.*).

But the development of sacerdotalism and ecclesiasticism deflected the Biblical 'pattern' of the Church's theology. In the New Testament and the early Church there was no priesthood within the Royal Priesthood of the Church, though there was of course apostolic authority of an unsacerdotal kind.

> 'From being the Eucharist of the sacrifice, *i.e.* of the people's free-will offering of its holy community, it became the sacrifice of the Eucharist, *i.e.* the offering of the crucified Christ for the sins of the world, those of the people included. The first sign of this change was the disappearance of the old conception of the Altar. It became increasingly difficult to see how sinful flesh and blood could constitute so holy a thing . . . With the Altar the sacrifice of brotherly love vanished also.
>
> 'The second sign of the change was the appearance of the new conception of "priesthood"; new, that is, in Christian thought, from which it virtually expunged the Royal Priesthood of the People (the *Laos* as a whole, not the laity). This divided the Church into two parts, the *Ordo*, *i.e.* those ordained to offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and the *Plebs*, *i.e.* the mass of the people . . . The result . . . was a new theory of "validity." What mattered supremely now was that the one true sacrifice should be truly and effectually presented (or re-presented) . . . What counted, therefore, now was not so much the unifying pastorate of the Bishop and his Presbyters as the fact that they had been properly commissioned and sanctified in their priestly office . . . It was the "priesthood," not the pastorate, whose character was taught to be indelible . . . It was "the Mass that mattered"; hence reception grew more and more infrequent, and what had been ordained to be the Feast of Holy Community became the means of salvation for individual souls' (pp. 85, 86).

What is needed, and urgently, is a re-awakening to the real status and function of the Church and its ministry.

> 'What we have to do to-day, I submit, is to learn the lesson of our failures and act upon it. Whether we use such of the old titles as are still relevant, or translate them into the equivalent English ("Bishop" and "Deacon" are not translations), or adopt new ones altogether, what we *want* is a Christian Ministry which will do what St. Paul says it was meant to do, *viz.* "perfect" the At-one-ment of the personal relationships of Christians in the one body' (p. 98).

And speaking of sacraments he says:

> 'If I am asked, for instance, whether I believe that those who have never been confirmed have never become "real" Christians, I reply that this is a "dead" question, and the sooner it is buried the better. Sacraments were not given us to un-Church those who lack them: they were given for At-one-ment, and if we do not use them for it, we were better without them altogether. It is only when we have all a "changed mind" about that that they will cease to be instruments of—schism' (p. 102).
>
> 'The Eucharist is the simplest of all natural symbols. Someone must distribute this food with human hands . . . But whether we really receive it or whether, when we receive it, it does us any good, depends entirely upon ourselves. If we do not want renewal in the one faith and the one love, it will not profit us that our Eucharist is "valid." If we do, it is ours for the asking' (p. 104).

'It is because the Church has forced its own reading upon these acts of God that his voice is no longer freely heard in them. They have become sacraments of the Church depending for their efficacy on a Ministry "validly" ordained. And when men take the instruments of God and imprison them in the cage of their own theology, they are already perilously near the verge of magic' (p. 107).

Dr. Phythian-Adams calls his last chapter 'The Ministry of the United Church'; in it he looks forward to the Church organized and functioning in accordance with the conclusions of his study. We can agree with him when he says:

'It is useless to talk about Apostolic Succession if it simply means an unbroken series of particular manual acts. No thinking man believes that the grace of a personal God is transmitted mechanically' (p. 110).

'The reason why so few men find a vocation to the Ministry is because it has become more and more an instrumental function, largely concerned with the soul-life of individual pietists. When "spiritual direction" comes to mean leadership in the fullest sense, we shall see, I think, a different picture' (p. 114).

But opinions will differ about the practical means he suggests in the Church that is to be. For though it is true that our Bishops as we know them are prone to 'prelacy' and overburdened with administrative duties, not many will want to see their order multiplied wholesale. Yet this is what Dr. Phythian-Adams suggests. He contends that episcopacy means something different from the feudal aberration of it which we have inherited, and that we must return to the true and primitive ideal of pastoral care and oversight. In the united and reconstituted Church, then, he would have the local congregation the basic unit, 'not so large as to make a real fellowship impossible, nor so small as not to be able to develop and exercise a real *esprit de corps*.' These in turn would be organized into dioceses, small enough to enable the Bishop to maintain personal and pastoral contact with the congregations. (No doubt this would appeal to the ex-Methodist circuit superintendents). These in turn would be grouped under numerous Metropolitans (*qui custodient custodes*, presumably) with the Lambeth primacy at the head. In addition, there will be a restoration of the Diaconate to its proper function as a settled office:

'For it is a very great loss (*i.e.* that the Diaconate should be a mere stepping-stone to the Presbyterate). It has created in our minds the impression that the money matters of the Church are not a real part of its spirituality, while in spite of this it has left the parish-priest or pastor to deal with them to the conscious neglect of his primary pastorate. The remedy . . . is the restoration of the Diaconate in a form suited to our modern economic conditions but fundamentally continuous with the past. Each Congregation will then have its Deacons charged with the administration of its property and finances under the chairmanship of the Pastor, *and therefore* taking their place at his side in the administration of the Eucharist . . . Both Pastor and Deacons will be recognized as serving the one Altar of flesh and blood, *i.e.* as supplying the needs of the living Church, whether spiritual, eleemosynary, or evangelistic' (p. 123).

Whatever may be thought of a much enlarged episcopate, this proposal for the diaconate is both feasible and, in these days as in others, needful. Moreover, it would enable the Church to enlist the services of many older men of experience in worldly affairs if a place could be found for them in the regular ministry, and one, too, in which their gifts might find better scope than in preaching or multiplying the existing number of Church services.

We do not anticipate that this book will be welcomed in all quarters. A blast

of fresh air blows through it which will make many shiver or shudder. Would that the blast might become a hurricane. For whether we agree or not with what the author has to say, it is bold and even revolutionary thinking of this sort, and not thinking only but action, which alone can save the Church of to-day and to-morrow from ever-diminishing numbers and influence.

A. W. ADAMS.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN LOVE*

This is a most timely book. While many people have a general notion of what sort of conduct is Christian, from their knowledge of the New Testament, few have a clear idea of the principles which are its foundation, or how to connect them into a coherent system. For the new Testament writings are occasional and unsystematic; while Jesus Himself gave His moral teaching in proverbs and stories, leaving it to others to draw out their implications and connect them with each other. Furthermore, Jesus taught in such an absolute and challenging way that the ordinary person is inclined to dismiss His words as quite unpractical. Our modern life and ways of thought have been greatly influenced by Christian ideas. But other ethical systems influence us too. Many people guide their lives by the natural ethics of Greece and Rome, ethics without religion, quite as much as by Christian ethics, whose centre is in God, not in man. And moral philosophers of the Christian era have often failed to give us really Christian ethics. For example,

> 'though Butler himself was a Bishop of the Church of England and definitely Christian in his theology, his doctrine of morality was autonomous rather than theonomous' (p. 42).

Kant's doctrine of the Categorical Imperative is also unsatisfactory from the Christian standpoint, although this is not always understood. Dr. St. John Ervine, for instance, in his excellent paper 'God and My Neighbour' delivered to the Modern Churchmen's Conference, 1945, spoke of Tennyson's poem, 'In a Children's Hospital.' The surgeon does his work excellently but is an agnostic and carries on entirely from a sense of duty. One of the nurses is a Christian and can only do her work because she believes in God's love for mankind through Christ. Dr. Ervine comments:

> 'The surgeon, if he had been an alert stoic, might have answered that his will to do well was greater than hers, since he was eager to heal the sick in spite of his disbelief in her hope, and that she was less a *Christian* (italics mine) than he was, since she could not serve in the wards without her assurance of Christ's approval and her heavenly reward' (*The Modern Churchman*, September, 1945; p. 190).

Dr. Ervine is wrong. The surgeon was not a Christian, because he acted only from a sense of duty. The nurse was a Christian, because she acted from the love of God, loving her patients in Him. The surgeon's ethics were natural, eithics without God, without religion. It should be added that in another paper at the same Conference, on 'Religion and Ethics,' Dean Mathews shows very well that ethical principles when carried to their logical conclusion imply a moral world order, God and immortality.

One great merit of Dr. Hirst's excellent book is that he shows so well how religion controls Christian ethics. For the Christian the first commandment is to love God; the commandment to love one's fellow-men comes only second; and one is commanded to love them not primarily for themselves but in God, for God's sake. Love and faith are the two principles of Christian ethics. In the last four chapters Dr. Hirst applies these principles to four

**Studies in Christian Love*, by E. W. Hirst. (Epworth Press; 8/6; 1944.)

human problems, self-sacrifice, sex-love, property and world-order. These chapters are independent of each other. Dr. Hirst handles his subjects wisely, honestly and fairly; those who desire practical guidance in these matters will find his book very helpful. Those who have a more speculative outlook will also appreciate them; but they will probably prefer Dr. Hirst's first three chapters, in which he discusses Christian ethics in general. Love is the guiding principle of Christian ethics, supported and controlled by faith in God. Are these principles in essential harmony with man's nature? Is the human soul naturally Christian? Dr. Hirst says it is. To consider first love:

> 'Man is too social to be merely selfish; and too obviously capable of self-regard to be merely social. In a word, there is in the foundation of his nature the psychological basis for an ethical ambivalence. The psycho-biological evidence seems to show that the normal life-process is at once individual and social. The Christian ideal of life, according to which self and neighbour love each other with a unitary regard, is, from the psychological standpoint, natural' (p. 14).

And now for faith:

> 'But man's interests are not merely on the horizontal plane. Besides his contacts with his fellows, he adopts an attitude to the universe around him' (p. 14). 'He seeks a Divine Being who will satisfy the longings of his soul, and apart from whom those longings are destined to remain unsatisfied' (p. 15).

What man asks from God are safety and love, each of which is incomplete without the other.

> 'He (man) can really feel safe only as he finds behind cosmic forces the control of a Person, and a Person of a certain character — a Person, in-love so faithful and so careful as to guard the meanest and humblest of His creatures' (p. 16). '. . . throughout life, even to old age, man is constantly presenting to the Universe demands for security and affection which, we suggest, obtain ideal satisfaction in a God of Omnipotent Love not only of sufficient power to maintain the world in being, but of such as Christianity reveals' (p. 17).

Dr. Hirst develops and illustrates these conclusions in a most interesting and valuable study.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE RESURRECTION AND PSYCHIC SCIENCE

SIR,

For those of us who are students of Psychic Science, the story of the Resurrection presents no difficulty. The problem of how to reconcile the Gospel story with probability only arises when the event is regarded as having been of a unique and miraculous order. For Psychic Science the story as it stands is a simple and circumstantial account of a Materialization, of which we have plentiful corroborative examples in our world of to-day. Our experiences corroborate the Gospel story, and the Gospel story confirms our belief in the validity of our own experiences. As F. W. Myers so aptly said, 'Because of

the new evidence' (provided by Psychic Science) 'every reasoning man a century hence will believe the Resurrection, whereas, in default of such evidence, every reasoning man a century hence will disbelieve it.'

M. A. St. Clair Stobart.

Dene Cliff, 31 Sandbourne Road,
Bournemouth West, Hants.

January 13th, 1946.

[Is the problem of the interpretation of the N.T. accounts of the Resurrection one of 'Materialization'? Is it not rather one of De-Materialization? What became of the physical body of Jesus?—Ed., *M.C.*]

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AND ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Sir,

May I inform members and subscribers of the arrangements which have been made for the Annual Meeting and for the Annual Elections?

The Rev. E. S. Loveday has most kindly invited us to join in his weekly service of Holy Communion at 11.30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 22nd, at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, after which the Annual Sermon will be preached by the Rev. T. Wigley, M.A., Chairman of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen. The Annual Meeting will be held in the Fellowship Hall, St. Martin's, at 3 p.m. and will be followed by an address the subject of which with the name of the speaker will be made known when the report and balance sheet for 1945 are circulated to members and subscribers.

The following members, having served for three years, are due to retire from the Council at the time of the Annual General Meeting and are not eligible for re-election, though they may be co-opted at the first meeting of the Council after the election, to serve until the Annual Meeting in 1947:—Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith, Rev. L. B. Cross, Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, Mr R. B. Henderson, Miss Hilda Hubbard, Rev. H. P. Kingdon, Rev. E. S. Loveday, Rev. Canon H. K. Luce, Ven. Archdeacon Mulliner.

The following members were co-opted to serve until the Annual General Meeting this year and are eligible either to be elected for three years or for co-option by the first meeting of the Council after the Annual General Meeting:—Miss E. M. Beaumont, Rev. A. G. Coombs, Mr. F. Victor Fisher, Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, Rev. L. C. Luckcraft, Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, Sir Edmund Phipps, Rev. Canon R. D. Richardson, Rev. C. F. Russell.

In accordance with a revised direction, authorized by the last meeting of the Council to meet present conditions, nominations with the names of proposers and seconders for election to the ten seats which will be vacant at the time of the Annual General Meeting should reach me not later than Wednesday, April 24th. Those elected will serve for three years.

R. Gladstone Griffith,
Hon. Secretary, M.C.U.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.

January 30th, 1946.

M.C. BRAINS TRUST

Owing to the very restricted allocation of paper for this issue of the *Modern Churchman*, the Brains Trust Section of the magazine under the question-master, the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, St. Stithian's Vicarage, Truro, has had to be held over until our June issue.—Ed., *M.C.*